

No 6
491

A
Second Narrative
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
AT
TURNERS-HALL,

The 29th of the Month called *April*, 1697.

Giving an exact Account of all the Proofs *G. K.* brought out of the *QUAKERS* Books, and Read in that MEETING, to prove them Guilty, of the Four great *ERRORS* he had Charged them with, in his Printed *Advertisements*; as also the most Material Speeches he made on every Head, with Reference to the Authors of those Books, and more Particularly with Reference to *G. W. T. E. W. P. J. Penington*, and them of the Second-days Meeting, at *LONDON*.

By *GEORGE KEITH.*

LONDON,
Printed for *B. Aylmer* at the *Three Pigeons* in *Cornhill*,
1697.

G. KEITH'S
Second Narrative
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS at *TURNERS-HALL*,
THE
Twenty ninth of the Month called *April*, 1697.

1. 8.

N^o 6
491

A
Second Narrative
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
AT
TURNERS-HALL,

The 29th of the Month called *April*, 1697.

Giving an exact Account of all the Proofs *G. K.* brought out of the *QUAKERS* Books, and Read in that MEETING, to prove them Guilty, of the Four great *ERRORS* he had Charged them with, in his Printed *Advertisements*; as also the most Material Speeches he made on every Head, with Reference to the Authors of those Books, and more Particularly with Reference to *G. W. T. E. W. P. J. Penington*, and them of the Second-days Meeting, at *LONDON*.

By *GEORGE KEITH*.

LONDON,
Printed for *B. Aylmer* at the *Three Pigeons* in *Cornhill*,
1697.



The Peace of God be among us.

IT will not be improper to give you an Account of the Occasion of this Meeting. We had a Meeting here the last Year, on the Eleventh Day of the Month called *June*, of this Nature; a *Narrative* of the Proceedings then is in Print. Some time after, there came out an Answer in Print to that *Narrative*, from one *Thomas Elwood* a *Quaker*, endeavouring to shew, that all, and every one of those things Charged against them, and all and every of the Proofs were falsely Alledged; that is to say, it could not be Proved that any of them were Guilty of any of those things Charged upon them. And as I told you formerly, I am not able to Print Books, as they can; They are many, and have a Common Stock, I am but one: Therefore I thought this the best way, not only to save Charge, but to give Occasion to many to know the Controversie, that would not otherwise have known it.

But, say they, it can be nothing but Hypocrisie, to pretend that He is not able to Print: for He has since Printed a *Narrative*, that is a large Book. But I did not Print that *Narrative* at my own Cost, the *Bookjellers* desired the Copy of me, and gave me 50 *Copys* for it, so that the Printing of that Cost me nothing; and the Printing of this *Narrative* will Cost me as little: And if the *Stationers* had undertaken to Print my other Books on their own Cost, I might have saved a great Deal of Charge.

My Business here now, is, partly to bring new Proofs out of their own Books, from their Most approved Ministers and Teachers, to Prove them Guilty of the same Errors. And partly, 2dly. so far as time will permit to shew that the defence that *G. Whitehead* and *Thomas Elwood* has made, is Invalid, Impertinent, and Sophistical. *G. Whitehead* has Printed a Book called an *Antidote against the Venom of the Snake in the Grass*; the most part of which Concerns not me, but the Author of that Book: But a great part of it does Concern me, wherein I am greatly wronged, and he Defends himself most Sophistically: Which I intend to shew in divers Particulars. He has Accused me most uncharitably, that I have Charged him against my Conscience; but my Conscience tells me no such thing, but assures me to the contrary. And truly it is a great advantage, both to you the Auditors, and to me, that this Controversie depends not upon Niceties of Dispute, or School-learning; it is plain Matter of Fact, such and such Things, such and such Words, such and such Doctrines, are to be found in their Books, which I leave to the Auditors to Judge, whether they are not Contradictory to the *Holy Scriptures* and to the Common Faith of all *Christendom*; for there is a Common Faith we all Profess, though there be great differences otherwise.

Then was Read the *Advertisment*, whereby *G. Keith* gave Notice of the Meeting.

They have Printed a Thing, and sent it to this Place, this Morning, which they call a *Protestation against this Advertisment*, but has no name to it, and therefore it is but a *Libel*, and I believe you think it not needful to Read it. And no body is here to own it. But some of the Auditors desired it might be Read which was done accordingly.

There are two things I think fit to take Notice of in this Paper. As for their Insinuation, that it is against Civil Authority, it is not against Civil Authority, when I have

have the permission of the Lord Mayor of this City for this Meeting before I Printed my Advertisement, and which I had since, from his own Mouth : And I hope the Lord Mayor of London knows better what belongs to his Duty, then they can tell him. And in token of it, here is one of the Marshals and his Servants to keep the Peace.

But the Second Thing I would Notice, is what they much Glory in, especially G. Whitehead in his *Antidote to the Snake*, that the Parliament has Recognized them to be Protestants. But if it be so (for it is a very high Favour) I appeal to the Auditory, whether they deserve such a Favour, and whether they be not extremely unthankful for it, to suffer to stand on Record such a most odious Reflection on the Church of England, (whereof all [or at least most of] the Members of Parliament are Sons, if I am rightly informed,) as I shall give you an Instance of. They Charge me with uncharitableness, Judge whether they be not extremely uncharitable, and whether they be not a very ungrate People. See Rich. Hubberthorns Collection, Page 229. This is the Second Edition of the Treatise, what particular Treatises have been Published by their Ministers they Collect them and Print them after their Decease, many of which will be standing Monuments of their shame, and the vile Errors and Heresies contained in them, do sufficiently prove them both to the present Age and succeeding Ages, that the Authors of these Books, wherein such Heresies are contained (who yet were Principal Teachers among the Quakers) did not deserve the Name of true Protestants, no nor of sound Christians : and what they think fit, they let stand ; but what they think fit to alter, they do alter ; and yet count it all as the Word of God. Now the Scripture says, *Cursed is he that adds to, or takes away*, and they have done both, Page 229, R. Hubberthorn is Answering what the Baptists say about Toleration, That they were not for the Toleration of Popery.

You shall see how he takes them up for it.

What confusion is here——*why will you not Tolerate Popery, as well as Episcopacie ? Have not the Professors of Episcopacie Murdered and slain, and do labour to Murder and slay the People of God, as well as the Papists, and why will you Tolerate the Common-Prayer, among the Episcopacie, and not the Mass Book among the Papists seeing that the Mass was the substance out of which the Common-Prayer, was Extrahed ?* G. Whitehead hath highly commended this man, in a Preface to his Book.

Let it be Judged who are uncharitable now, and whether they are not very unthankful for such a Recognition to suffer such an uncharitable Censure to remain on Record against the Church of England.

The next thing is, they Clamour against me for Erecting a *Spiritual Court*. If I have set up a *Spiritual Court*, they have shewn me their Example ; They have Erected a *Spiritual Court* to Judge all the Ministers of England, Witness here a very Solemn Procedure ; this Book has been twice Printed, the Title is, *a just and Lawful Tryal of the Teachers and Professed Ministers of England*.

Note this takes in Presbyterians and all others, The first Edition was 1657, in the time of the Common-Wealth, and Signed by a Friend to Englands Common-Wealth, for whose sake this is Written, and sent abroad, E. B. But the Second Edition came out 1672, Nine Years after his death, with a much larger Title, viz. *a just and Lawful Tryal of the Teachers and Professed Ministers of this Age and Generation, (which includes all Protestant Ministers in Scotland, Ireland, Holland, France, and every where else, as well as in England,) by a perfect proceeding against them, and hereby they are righteously Examined, and justly weighed, and truly measured, and Condemned out of their own Charges, and judged by their own Professed Rule, viz. the Scriptures, and being brought to the Bar of justice these things are truly Charged against them, and Legally proved upon them.*

Now I have been more fair in that they call my Judicature by my giving Notice to the Persons concerned before-hand, to hear the things charged and proved against them, which E. B. had not done, and not one of many hundreds ever knew that such a judicial Sentence,

tence, by such a perfect proceeding; and *Legal Trial*, (as he calls it) was ever past against them, viz. that they are contrary to all the Ministers of Christ in former Ages, and agree with all the false Prophets and Deceivers, in their Call, Maintenance, Doctrines, Conversation and Practice. [Strange! all the Ministers of this Age by E. B's. judicial Sentence are contrary to all the Ministers of Christ in former Ages, and agree with all the false Prophets and Deceivers, in their Doctrine and Practice, &c. except the Ministers among the People called *Quakers*, and yet both Sorts shall pass for Protestants!] though I disown any such thing as to set up a *Spiritual Court*. But I hope it is Lawful for me to contend for the *Christian Doctrine* and to Witness against the contrary, But they will not be Here. What then? May I not refute their Errors? It is their Fault they will not be present. But besides, they have, a very High Court of *Judicature*, which they Set up Yearly, their Yearly Meeting wherein, I here undertake to make it good, that some of their Decrees and Orders are Point blank Contradictory to Acts of Parliament, I do no such thing. And there is this difference between their *Spiritual Court*, and that they call Mine; They called me to their *Spiritual Court* without my Consent, and in *Pennsylvania* they Excommunicated me without my Knowledge. Here indeed they sent me word that they had something to do with me, and I readily went, and did what I could to Answer for my Self. But the issue of it was, the next Year, because I would not Answer to their Most unjust Command, therefore they gave out a *Bull* or *Bill* of Excommunication against me. *G. Whitehead* says in his late Book, it was a Conditional Disowning *i. e.* [Excommunication.] Did you ever hear the like? Let any Read that Printed Paper, they will find there is in it no Condition at all, except they mean that they have not declared me to have committed the unpardonable sin (as some have said of me) but leave room to a possibility of Repentance, but at this rate, every Excommunication is Conditional, which yet is False: and it is all Generals, there is not one thing particularly Charged against me as to Life or Doctrine. Now I say there is this difference between their *Court* and what they call Mine; They kept their Doors so close, that they would not suffer one Person to come in that would shew me the least Justice or Favour; there were divers (that offered to come in, they would not suffer them to come in; and there were divers) in, and they put them out, and would not proceed till they were put out. What I do, is above Board, it is Free, the Doors are Open to all sorts of moderate People.

They say I make my Self the Judge. They did make themselves Judges in my Case, who were my Accusers, and known to be prejudiced Persons against me, and seeing they gave wrong Judgment against me, I have just Cause and Right to make it be known, that their injustice be made manifest, for the undeceiving of such who have a better Opinion of them than they deserve.

But whereas they say I am both Accuser and Judge. I hope one Man may as well be a just Accuser, as another may be an unjust one, I have Charged them, and I leave it to the Auditors, Consciences, to Judge, next to God and next to the Holy Scriptures. I only reserve to my Self that Privilege, that all true Protestants Claim, that is a Judgement of Discretion, to judge for my Self, but not to impose my Judgment on any other Persons.

Now I begin with my new Proofs, as to the First Head, which is, that Faith in Christ, as he outwardly suffered at *Jerusalem*, is not necessary to our Salvation. See *G. Fox*, he is Answering one *Christopher Wade*.

What *C. Wade* says is very foolish, in this particular, Page 246. *Great Mystery* by *G. Fox*. pr. He saith, it is whimsical to say, Christ God and man, flesh and Spirit is in them. *Ans.* Contrary to the Apostles Doctrine (saith *G. F.*) who said, they were of his flesh, and of his bone, and Christ in you, &c. Again, his Query is, whether God could not have saved man without Christs dying? To which *G. Fox* Answers, pag. 252. *Great Mystery*.

* *Ans.* God can do what he will, who was in Christ reconciling himself to the World, [this * not rightly quoted, see 2 Cor. 5. 19.] and Christ did not save the World without God—and * the Devil was in thee, and thou saist, thou art Saved by Christ without thee, so hast

Re-

* Recorded thy Self a Reprobate and ignorant of the Mystery of Christ within thee, for without that thou dost not know Salvation. The man did not say, he was Saved by Christ without him, without the Spirit of Christ within him; but he expressly owns that necessary to Salvation, as you shall hear, *Pag. 4.* he Quotes and approves (in his Book called *Quakery Slain*) *T. M.* saying, *The Majesty of God, whose Throne is in Heaven, is in his inspections, influences and Operations every where, and in his Glorious and Spiritual Presence, and manifested nighness in and through his Son, dwelling in Sion, even in the hearts and Societies of his People, See also his pag. 7 and 19. to the same purpose.*

So there is nothing that *G. Fox* can Banter him for, but for saying he is Saved by Christ without him. Now Judge whether this be not one effectual Proof. But you shall see more.

Great Mystery, p. 249. He blames *C. Wade* for saying that there is not whole Christ, both God and Man. in Men: Truly if I believed that, I think I should not need any Christ without me. *G. Fox* Answers, *Then how must Men grow up in the measure of the fulness of the Stature of Christ,* but this proves not they must have the fulness or whole Christ in them but the measure. Note, The Measure of the fulness, not the fulness it self. *Ephes. 4. 13. 7.* The fulness of the God-head dwelt only in our Lord Jesus Christ and still dwells, of whose fulness we all receive, but in none else, *pag. 149.* *C. Wade* says, *that neither Gods Essence nor the Heaven, nor Christs Person was in Peters holy body.* *G. F. Answers,* Here thou art striving against the Apostles Doctrine, &c. But the Apostle said not that Christs Person, whole Christ, God and Mans Flesh and Spirit, was in Peters holy body, or in any other Saints.

Judge now, if this be a Proof, that whole Christ, God and Man, dwells in the Saints. Here is a manifest Perverfion of that Scripture. *Eph. 4. 13.* Compared with *7. the Saints grow up to the measure, not the fulness.* Page 246. He pleads that Christ, God and Man, Flesh and Spirit is in them, he that eats his Flesh, hath it within him. [Note, this is to make it like a Corporal Eating, as when Men eat Flesh, because it goes into the Stomack, it must be in them.] this Answ. he gave contradicting his Opponents sound Assertion, that Christ was absent from Men as touching his Flesh. *Great Mystery, pag. 210.*

Now if he means not the outward Body, it is a piece of Sophistry: for *C. Wade* Argues that his Body cannot be divided, and one Saint have one peice, or measure of his Flesh, and another have another, Flesh and Bone cannot be a Measure in one, and a Measure in another, saith *C. W.* Now see what *G. Fox* says, *Great Mystery, Page 246.*

He charges him, that it is contrary to the Apostle to say, that it (*viz. the flesh and bone of Christ*) cannot be a Measure in one and a Measure in another. And if this be true, there is no Christ without us; for his Flesh and Bone is divided among the Saints, one hath one Measure, another hath and another, and yet every one hath the whole Christ in them, God and Man, Flesh and Spirit, according to *G. Fox's* Doctrine.

I should have told you (which I hope is not much out of Season now) that if any of them Object and say, What is this to us that *G. Fox* says so? *G. Fox* is not *G. Whitehead*, or *T. Elwood*. But *John Penington*, in a late Book the People called Quakers cleared, &c. *pag. 7.* says, *God is the same, Truth is the same, his People the same, their Principles are the same, but G. Keith is not the same.* Now *G. Fox* was the chiefest Teacher they had, and had a great Power over them. I believe never a Bishop since the Apostles had that Power, as he had over the Quakers, which I suppose here in England are 100000, besides what are in other Parts, to all whom *G. Fox* gave forth Orders to which they have submitted (excepting some Dissenters that are not reckoned in the unity on that account); Therefore what you prove against one, you prove against all, as touching these 4 Principles, or any other Matters; they are not Changed in a Tittle, they are the same that ever they were.

Now can any but Mad-men or Hypocrits hold contradictions to be true. They have
Printed

Printed divers things of late, Charging me with Contradictions. I say I am not Chargeable with Contradictions, I shall give you my Reasons. 1. Because most of them are no Contradictions. 2. Some of these things they call my Contradictions, are things wherein I have found further Conviction and Illumination of Gods Spirit, in the use of the Holy Scriptures. I have Retracted divers things in my former Books, but I do not therefore Contradict. He Contradicts, who holds *simul & semel* Contradictory Propositions. Now that they are guilty of, and not I: He calls it *Sauls Zeal* in his Opponent, for saying, G. F. *Great Mystery*, Page. 224. it is a Sottish Doctrine, to direct People only to the Light within. Is it not a Sottish Doctrine, to direct People to the Light within only, as if that were only to be directed to?

But here is a very Notable Passage yet, which in so many express Words G. Whitehead has owned in his *Antidote against the Venom of the Snake*; The light within, that every Man hath, is sufficient to Salvation without any thing else. *Job. Miller*, says that it is an Error, to say, 'that the Light which every one hath that cometh into the World is sufficient to Salvation, without the help of any other means or discovery.'

Now what Light hath every one, but that which is in him? See how G. F. takes him up. Pag. 47. *Great Mystery*, he saith what *John Miller* had said is contrary to Christ, and Christ will dwell in Man, and walk in man, and what need they have any more helps—again, so he is the only means without any other helps, to wit the Light in Men, and to this, the Light in Men, he applyeth that place in Scripture, *there is no Salvation by any other name*, &c. So by this Doctrine, his intercession without us we have no need of at all, &c. I appeal to you, if this is not a great Error, making Christ without as he became a Sacrifice for us, and is now our intercessor in Heaven, of no Necessity to us.

There is a passage or Two yet, that I would not slip, *Great Mystery*, pag. 247. says &c. Christ doth not dwell in them (viz. the Saints) Personally. G. F. Answers, Thou sayest, you see what sort of English, he has here and elsewhere often thou saith, for thou sayst, and they was, for they were.

G. F. has Printed a *Primmer*, to teach both the Universities, and a Battle-dore to teach them to speak true English, but he speaks very bad English himself. See *Great Mystery*, p. 66. 149, 174. Christ that made the World before it was made, what English is this? How did Christ make the World before it was made, except he did refer to the Idea Platonica, which I suppose he knew nothing of.

Great Mystery, 247. Thou sayest Christ doth not dwell in them personally, doth not Christ dwell in his Saints, as he is in the person of the Father, the Substance.

Now pray take Notice of two things here, you know what a work they have made about three Persons saying it is not Scripture Language.

G. F. has owned two Persons, viz. the Person of the Father, and the Person of the Son, Christ dwelling personally in the Saints. If they will shew me where two Persons are express in Scripture, I will shew them where three Persons are express. They that find so much Fault with unscripture Language, use abundance such. G. Whitehead in his *Antidote*, pag. 124. useth the word *introversion* borrowed from Popish Mysticks, I do not blame the word rightly understood but I shew their partiality, they will borrow unscripture words from Popish Authors, which suits with them, but other words, though agreeing with Scripture, if not express, they reject, as Christ God Man, G. W. rejects as a Popish term, though it is implied in the word *Immanuel*, God with us, i. e. the word made Flesh, and uniting himself to the true Nature of Man, so that one and the same Christ is both God and Man, for Christ God is not one Christ, and Christ Man, another, but one and the same. And in their *Bull* of Excommunication they gave out against me, to signify their Unity in giving that Sentence, they say, the Divine sense, in the openings of the Heavenly life ran as a mighty stream through the Meeting? What Scripture have they for this Language, I had Charged it to be Nonsense in my Answer to their *Bull*, *Tho. Elwood* justifies it, but brings no place of Scripture, for any such Phrase, he

blames me, for changing the term from a Divine Sense to Mens Sense: But whatever Divine Sense Men have, though it be Gods effectively, as the prime efficient of it, yet it is mens Sense Subjectively, seeing men only are the subject of reception, and, seeing all Sense in the Souls of men, whether it be called Divine or Humane is some modification, or inherent quality in the Soul, that cannot be separated from its subject, to say that Sense they have, could run through the Meeting, when all the men sat still in their Seats, I say that is Non-sense unless with Papists they will say, that accidents can be separated from their subjects, and this is a fair inlet to the Popish Transubstantiation. I hope this is no offensive diversion. But to return to the matter, I shall add one Passage more out of a Book of *G. Fox*, called the *Heathens Divinity set upon the heads of all called Christians*, that say, they had not known there had been a God, or a Christ unless the Scripture had declared it unto them. Ye see he prefers the Heathens to all called Christians, but he wrongs them called Christians in his Title, as if they did say, they had not known that there had been a God unless the Scripture had declared it to them. All Christians generally own it that it may be known that there is a God without the Scripture, but they say, the Holy Scriptures, are the ordinary means whereby the knowledge and Faith of Christ is wrought in the hearts of Believers, by the illumination and operation of the Holy Spirit, and for the *Quakers* or any others to say, they had known what they know of Christ, without Scripture is great presumption, and is an undervaluing of Scripture, and making it useless. *G. Foxes* design in this Book is to prove the Heathens to be Christians, and the Christians to be Heathens. But his Arguments are weak being some Testimonies. Collected out of the Scriptures, to prove that divers Heathens or Gentiles had some knowledge of God, and some Moral virtues, But that is not enough to denominate them Christians, or to give them a Title to Eternal Life, that is Life Eternal, (not to know God only, as a Creator,) but to know God, as he hath given us his Dear Son, and to know Jesus Christ his Dear Son, whom he hath sent into the world to dye for our sins, to reconcile us unto God. None of all the places he quotes, prove that the Heathens had the knowledge of Christs incarnation, death, and sufferings. The knowledge that *Abraham*, and *Job* had, and many others of Christ, was by special Revelation, and Extraordinary. As to what he Quotes out of Scripture concerning *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Dan. 3.* that he saw a fourth together with the three, in the fiery Furnace, and the form of the fourth was like the Son of God; this proves not what he brings it for, that may be questioned, whether this fourth, was Christ, for Angels in Scripture are called *Sons of God*, again, suppose it was Christ, this doth not prove, that *Nebuchadnezzar* had any knowledge, that Christ was to be Incarnate; therefore it doth not prove that he was a Christian, and beside the Case was extraordinary. And to Argue from some particular, that the common illumination in all Heathens either did or would give them all that was needful to be known of God and Christ without all outward instruction is not true Reasoning.

I come next to give you some Quotations out of *E. Burrough* to prove the first head, next to *G. Fox*, he was one of their Principal Teachers.

In pag. 306. of his Works Collected. He brings *John Bunyon* saying, they that follow Christ aright must follow him without to the Cross, without for Justification, or Mount Calvary without, they must seek for Justification without, the Spirit of Christ it leads to Christ without.

This I Judge to be sound Doctrine, but see how he takes him up, saith *E. B.* Reader see if this be not near unto Popery, or enquire else what he means, as if he would have people to go a Pilgrimage, and this (he saith,) is contrary to Rom. 10. 6. 7. 8. it cannot be supposed that *E. B.* was so ignorant to think that *John Bunyon*, or any other of a Protestant Profession, was for People going a Pilgrimage to Mount Calvary where Christ suffered. His meaning is plain, the Spirit of Christ within leads to Christ without, viz. not by Local motion of the body, but by Faith, and the pious remembrance, and meditation of Christs passion, as he suffered without us, but this *E. B.* saith

faith is contrary to *Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8.* and so saith *G. Whitehead* in his *Light and Life*, pag. 38. and *Pag. 61* He saith, another while people must seek their Saviour above the Clouds, and the Firmament contrary to the righteousness of Faith, *Rom. 10. 6.* another while they must look to *Jerusalem* for justification, to the blood that was there shed, Contrary (saith *G. W.*) to *Deut. 30. 13, 14.* and *Rom. 10.* But both these Mens saying, that it is contrary to *Deut. 30.* or *Rom. 10.* to direct to Christ as he suffered at *Jerusalem*, or as he is now ascended above the Clouds and Firmament with respect to his bodily presence, bespeaks their great ignorance and unbelief, for plain contrary to their Antichristian Doctrine, that place in *Rom. 10. 8, 9, 10.* directeth us to Christ both as he suffered Death and rose again, as the object of our Faith, if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart, that God hath raised him from the Dead, thou shalt be saved. Now where did God raise Christ from the Dead, but where he dyed, and where was that but at *Jerusalem*?

Again, I shall read to you, some Queries of *Ed. Burr.* that will show you, how little necessary he thought it to preach Faith in Christ without. *Pr. pag. 150, 151.* among other he hath these Queries. *What is that which worketh Faith and where it is, within or without,* last part of the 2d. Query. *Is that within the Creature or without him, which works the new Birth?* last part of the 3d. Qu. *Is not the light of God sufficient in it self to lead unto God, all that follow it yea, or nay,* last part of the 4th. Qu. *Whether it is possible that any can be saved without Christ manifest within; If no, then whether it is not the Doctrine of Salvation, which is only necessary to Preach Christ within. And is it not the whole Mystery of Salvation, God manifest in the Flesh, [by Flesh it is plain he means the Flesh of the Saints.] Qu. 6. And is he not a deceiver that Exhorts People for Salvation to any other thing then the light of Christ, yea, or nay. And how hath Christ enlightned every man in the world if not within him?* Here ye see he will not have Christ without us to have any part in working Faith, or the new Birth in us, but gives it wholly to Christ within, and seeing none can be Saved without Christ Manifest within, that is the Doctrine of Salvation, that is only necessary to Preach, Christ within. If it be said these are Queries, and no Conclusions, I Answer, Though they be proposed as Queries, yet seeing it is by opposition, to the Person he Disputes with, it is Evident they are equivalent to Conclusions, and it is easie to Judge in such a Case, whether a mans Queries be his or his Adversaries Conclusions, they were not his Adversaries to be sure, and why did he propose them, but in opposition to him who did Plead for Salvation by the *Man Christ* without, as well as by the Spirit of Christ within.

The next great Author, to prove the First Head, I shall bring is, *Will. Smith* in his *Catechism*, pag. 56, 57. Quest. *How do you manifest it, (viz. Christ within) to be the only foundation, and that there is not another?* Answer. 'From the unchangeableness of its own Nature and being, for we know that God doth not lay any visible or changeable things for a Foundation, but that which is of himself within.—Quest. *And is that within you, the only Foundation, upon which you stand, and the Principal of your Religion.* Answer. That of God within us, is so, for we know it is Christ, and being Christ that must needs be only and Principal, for that which is only, admits not of another and that which is Principal is greatest in being; and thus we know Christ in us, to be unto us, the only and Principal who was before all things, and by whom all things consist. Note, Here is not a word of the *Man Christ* to be any wise concerned in their Foundation, but *Christ within*, who was before all things, &c.

Again, in his *Primmer*, pag. 8. he brings in the Father teaching the Child, and giving him a Rule to distinguish betwixt the true Ministers of Christ and the false. The Father saith whv, *they that are false, Preach Christ without, and bid People believe in him, as he is in Heaven above, but they that are true Ministers, they Preach Christ within, and direct People to wait to feel him in themselves, &c.* [and in pag. 13. He most perversly applyeth to that the Light within, which Christ, as he rose from the dead, spake of himself, *all Power in Heaven and Earth is init.*] But let me here acquaint ycu, with a secrecy. In the Collection of *William Smiths* Works, that Passage in the *Primmer*, pag. 8. is

changed after this manner, that true Ministers Preach Christ not without only, but also within, but false Ministers Preach him only without, I have not the Book here but I am sure, the words are to this effect: But when was that passage changed, or by whom? not by W. Smith, but long after his Decease some began to find Fault with the Expression, and I for one, which gave occasion to some, at the Printing the Collection so to change it, but they never gave Notice that it was an Error, nor gave the left warning against it as it stood in the *Primmer*, but let it remain as it was, and hath been several times so Printed, and has been more generally in the hands of People, than the Collection, and has Poisoned the minds of the Youth exceedingly among the *Quakers*, it has been several times Reprinted, without any alteration, and the alteration that was made after the Authors Decease, is contradictory to the whole design both of the *Primmer*, and *Catechism*, which was to set up the Light within as the only Foundation without us.

Minister Stephens being present spoke out of the Balcony, G. Keith not to interrupt you, tell us about what time this correction in W. Smiths Book was made, and that you complained of that Passage, for this will evidence you to have been Orthodox in that Point. G. K. I give thee thanks Friend for this Observation, what the particular Year was, wherein the Collection of his Works was Printed, I do not remember, the Book itself will show, which I have not here but this, to wit the *Primmer* and *Catechism* was Printed in 1668, and is not the first Impression of it. And though Clandestinely they would seem to reform their former Principles, yet they profess Openly, they are the same that ever they were, they are not Changed in a title: There is another Book of W. Smiths, called *Universal Love, Containing instructions to Children, to young Persons, and to all sorts of People*, in all the Book you shall not find the left Direction, or Instruction to believe in Christ without, but all to the Light within, as the only Foundation. Some may think, here are Proofs enough already given, but when these and Ten times more are given, their Ministers have so much Power over the People generally that, they dare not Read, what is Printed against them.

Another great Author, who was a great Minister among them, whom I shall produce is William Bailly, in the Collection of his Works after his Decease. In his Treatise called a *Testimony of the Light in me from my Childhood*. Pag. 22.— But he is the same that Redeemed Man, by his blood in Parenthesis (*the life*) out of the earth, and what this blood the life is, he tells you, Pag. 23.—others of them, viz. the Baptists (*among whom he saith, he formerly went*) with envious words strived to get me back to them, telling me, that I was fallen from Grace, and was become under the Law, and making the blood of Christ, of none effect: But I not knowing then, the blood to be the life, and that the life is the light of Men, though I was Convinced in my Conscience of the Eternal Truth. And thus in these very words, sometime ago, W. Penn was heard to Preach, the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. What blood? The blood is the Life, and the Life is the Light, and the Light is within. Again, William Bailie, pag. 577, to that Question, do you Quakers own that blood of Christ, which was shed without the gates of Jerusalem upon the Cross, &c. Do ye own Justification by this blood, which was visible, which we believe you do not, for we could never hear you directly Answer us to this matter, but evade it by other terms, and shuffle it off. To this see his Answer, pag. 578. 'As for the word visible blood, and visible man, which thou so much talkest of, in this kind, they are terms, quite beside the Language of the Scriptures of truth, or else I am very ignorant of such Translations.—again, after he had cited, John 6.53. He saith, these words of truth we own and witness, but your word visible flesh, and visible blood, which ye would strain us up to express to answer your wills and dark imaginations, we do not Read from Christ nor his Apostles, in all the Scriptures? Here observe what made him refuse to own Justification by that visible Blood, and found Fault so much both with the words visible flesh, and visible Blood, even because his Notion was that the outward and visible flesh and outward and visible blood of Christ was one thing, and the inward and invisible flesh and blood

blood was another, and that not by the outward and visible, but by the inward and invisible, the Life, which is the Light within, as he above Phrased it, we obtain Salvation, and are justified. And for a further Confirmation of his Sense, hear his following words, pag. 579.—Then tell me O ye Professors of Christ, and his Apostles words, who say they are your Rule, what is that flesh, that is meat indeed, and what is that flesh, that profits nothing, seeing both are the words of Truth.—Observe here he makes the visible Flesh of Christ to be that which profits not, but the invisible to be that which is Meat indeed; and in this he agrees with the Ranters and other vain Notionists, who by Flesh in these words, the Flesh profits nothing, understand the outward Body, of Christs Flesh, as if thereby Christ had taught them to undervalue it, which to be sure he did not. But to this most Antichristian Sense of *W. Bailie*, of the flesh that profits nothing, I oppose the General Sense of all pious Christian Teachers, that Christ did not thereby undervalue or Teach others to undervalue, his outward and visible flesh, as if it were unprofitable; but he spoke these words, in opposition to the Carnal Capernaimites, who did most Carnally, and with the wisdom of the Flesh, imagine that he Taught them, they were to Eat his Flesh with the outward Mouth, as if he had said, the outward eating my Flesh, or my Flesh, suppose ye did or could outwardly Eat it, with the outward Mouth, that would not profit you, to Salvation: And as some others have truly said, the Flesh without the Spirit of Christ, (if any should exalt the one, and reject the other) will not profit. But what a wretched inference it is, to say, that his outward and visible Flesh that was broken for us on the Cross, and his outward and visible blood that was shed for us, doth not profit for Justification, and Salvation, as we have the sincere Faith of it, wrought in us by the Spirit of Christ. How contrary is this to plain Scripture particularly, *Coloss. i. 20, 21, 22*. And whereas *W. Bailie* doth not own Justification by that visible Blood it is evident as the Sun, he meant the outward Blood of Christs body, for he could not be so ignorant as not to know that was visible, for that which was seen, was visible, and *John* saw it, and he that saw, bare Record, *John 19. 34. 35*. But though *W. B.* Here, and the 2d. Days Meeting who hath Published his Works, or at least suffered them to be Published, without Publickly witnessing against them, denyeth Justification by that visible Blood, yet *G. W.* now of late, owneth that Material Blood, to have been a Part of the Offering by which we are both Justified and Sanctified, though in down right Contradiction to his own Doctrine, in his *Light and Life*, as I have showed, and intend yet more to show. Now let *G. W.* Answer for *W. B.* Seeing they are all one in Principle, as God and Truth are the same, by *Jo. Penningtons* Assertion. 1. Was not that Material Blood of Christs Body, which *G. W.* doth of late confels to have been a part of the Offering for Justification, and Remission of sin, visible Blood? 2. If it was how doth he Reconcile his late Doctrine of Justification by that material Blood to *W. Bailsies* Doctrine, denying Justification by that visible Blood? Can their pretended infallibility make two plain Contradictories to be true? But *W. Penn*, in his *Christian Quaker*, useth the word, visible appearance of Christ several times, and maketh no exception against the word visible as being not Scripture Language, yea *W. Bailie* himself useth it in this very Treatise, pag. 600 While he thus by way of Query Disputes against his Opponents, whether the visible Person of flesh and bones be the only Saviour, seeing the Apostle saith the ingrafted word is able to save the Soul, and the Grace of God, that bringeth Salvation, hath appeared to all men? And who was Enochs Saviour, and the Prophets, who were before that visible flesh and bones was? This sufficiently demonstrates, that *W. B.* did own that there was a visible Person of visible Flesh and Bones, but ye see he will not have him to be the only Saviour, but the ingrafted word the Grace that hath appeared to all Men, as if that Grace, were not the Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ who was both God and Man, and remaineth so for ever to be, and whose body was visible Flesh, Blood and Bones. But that the visible Body, of Christ, without the Soul of Christs Man-hood, and without the God-head of Christ was theonly Saviour, I never knew any so to affirm, and

and therefore his Question was idle, and impertinent except to show his erroneous^s Opinion, that Christ was only our Saviour as he was God, and not as both God and Man, as is plainly implied in his First Query, pag. 100. *Whether there be any more Saviours of the immortal Soul but one, &c.* But the Answer is so easie that a Child of eight years Age, that have received a Christian Education (which too few of their Children receive, for indeed few of them have it to give) can Answer it. The Saviour both of Soul and Body is but one, and that one is Jesus Christ, who is both God and Man, and who as Man hath a Reasonable Created Soul, and a true Created Body of a man, the Nature of whose God-head is not the Nature of his Man-hood, yet because these two Natures are most excellently and wonderfully united into one, therefore Jesus Christ the Saviour is but one only Saviour, and because the inward Principle of Grace whereby he saveth us, is his, and cometh by him, and through him, from God the Father; yet all this maketh no more Saviours than one: and his Quibbling against it, doth but show his great ignorance, and error.

But again hear further this great Minister and Teacher among the Quakers, pag. 600 *The Apostle Preached Christ the word nigh in the heart and in the mouth, and the ingrafted word is able to save the soul, so he did not Preach a visible Christ with Flesh, and Bones as you do—and Paul Preached God that made the world, &c. that was not far from every one of us, the invisible God, but you Preach a visible Man, with, flesh and bones at a great distance from all People, above, where the Sun Moon and Stars are, &c.* Here ye see is plain Language, I appeal to all the judicious in this Auditory, whether this is not a plain Proof to both the first Heads, for he that man that dyed for our sins without the Gates of Jerusalem was a visible man, and had visible Flesh, and blood, whom the Apostles did Preach, as he dyed for us, and reconciled us in his body of Flesh, as well as his inward and invisible appearance by his Light, Grace, and Spirit in mens hearts, [Read and compare these following Places of Scripture together, how both Peter and Paul preached the Man Christ Jesus whom the Jews Crucified, and certainly that was a visible man. *Acts 2. from v. 22. 36; Acts 3, from v. 13 to 26. Acts 10, from v. 36 to 43. Acts 13, from v. 26. to 40. Acts 17. 31. Acts 26. 23. Rom. 8. 32. 34. 2 Cor. 5. 14. 15.*]

I shall bring yet another Proof out of W. Baillies works, to prove the first Head, pag. 308—*and so he taught them to pray, Our Father, &c.* Not to look at his Person, and pray to him as a Person without them, but bid them Pray to their Father. Here Note the words, *not to look to his Person*, if they were not to look to his Person, and pray to him, as a Person without them then by the same Argument they were not to believe in him, as a person or man without them, for the object of Faith and prayer is the same, as the Apostle Paul said; how shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed, so it holds well to argue how shall they believe in him, on whom they do not call, or to whom they do not pray.

Like to this is another of their pretended infallible Teachers William Shewen who hath said in his Book of *Thoughts*, pag. 14.—He cannot write contrary to the Holy Scriptures being in unity with them, and with the just mens Spirits that Wrote them, this man far exceeded Paul, who knew a man *after his conversion* caught up to the Third Heaven, and into Paradise, &c. Fourteen Years before that time he so writ, but W. Shewen saith he knew a man 24 Years ago from the time he Writ who had Heavenly sights and Revelation, and Raptures into the Third Heaven, and heard and saw things unutterable ravished with delight, &c. *and all before his Conversion* but this is contrary to our Saviors Doctrine, *unless a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God*; yet surely to be caught up to Paradise is as much as to see it. See his *Five Christian Faith*, Cap. 15. Now let us hear further what this infallible Doctor hath taught contrary to the Holy Scriptures, in his Treatise of *Thoughts*, Pag. 37. *Not to Jesus, the Son of Abraham, David and Mary, Saint or Angel, but to God the Father all Worshipp, Honour and Glory is to be given through Jesus Christ, &c.* Is not this abominable, [Can the

the Church of England own such men to be Protestants, who frequently pray in their Liturgy, *Son of David have mercy on us*, which is a Scripture expression, now if Jesus the Son of David be not to be prayed to, he is not to be believed in, as the Saviour. Again, hear another Passage pag. 38. 'when he is thus known to perform all these Offices in ' and for his People he is then by such known to sit down at the Right Hand of God, ' having accomplished the work the Father gave him to do; having put all things under, and restored all things into their Primitive order, he then is also known to surrender up the Kingdom to the Father, and God to become all in all, and on the Margin he adds, 'this is the Ascending of Christ up, where he was before he Descended, and ' before there was any cause for his Descension; he that can understand, let him. [Let sober Readers judge if this be not allegorizing away Christs Ascension and Kingdom to come as if it were already at an end,] this man was one of the three in the Year 1678, that opposed these three Heads of Doctrine mentioned in my first *Narrative* pag. 38. 39. particularly that Christ Ascended bodily into Heaven, and that Christ was to be prayed unto.

Having given you sufficient new Proofs for the first Head, (besides the old given the last year, to which they have given weak and Sophistical defences, as I intend to show, so far as time will permit, and that will suffice for the rest at present [for as is the part or parts so is the whole as ye may judge of the whole Cask, what sort of Liquor it contains by Tasting it, in several of its parts] I shall now Read to you my New Proofs, On the second Head which is, that *Justification and Sanctification is not by the blood of Christ outwardly shed*, all who own Justification by the blood of Christ outwardly shed, own justification by the most holy and perfect Obedience of Christ imputed to us, which he performed in his own Person for us without us, God for Christs sake, as he dyed and shed his most precious blood for us, pardoning our sins, and accepting us in and through Christ; so that justification by the blood of Christ outwardly shed, and the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, are so closely joyned, that to deny the last is to deny the first. But these Teachers among the *Quakers*, whom I shall mention, have a false Notion and Sense of imputation in this Case, and of the imputed Righteousness of Christ they have grossly corrupted the word imputed, as if it signified *imputed*, or *put in us*, but this is a far greater Corruption of the Language, both in *Latin* and *English*, than to say you to a single person, and this gross perversion, and perverse Sense of the word imputed righteousness to signify righteousness wrought, and put in us, I found first in the Book called *Love to the Lost*; diverse here know, who the Author of it was, I need not name him. On the Second Head, concerning Righteousness within 8 or 9 Lines from the beginning of the Chapter he saith — *and there be many talkers of this righteousness, but none inherit it further than by Faith they receive the Son of righteousness, and with him his righteousness is freely imputed, or put into the Creature*, Note his Sense of the word *imputed*, as if it were from the word *impono*, to put in which is not so, but from the word or Particle *in*, and *puto*, to think or reckon, or estimate, so that not only what a man doth by himself, in common Speech is imputed to him, but what one man doth for another, which he cannot do for himself, that other mans Act imputed to him, as when one man payeth another mans Debt. Thus Christ having performed that most Holy and perfect Obedience unto God, that fully satisfies and Answers the righteousness of Gods Law, which we were not able to do and perform our selves what Christ hath done for us is imputed to us; and this is the true Sense of imputed righteousness according to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and all Orthodox Christians, which this False Notion of imputed to signify imputed or put in us, destroyeth.

Again I find G. Fox his Notion, of imputation, in his *Great Mystery*, where he delivers a very strange Doctrine, I suppose you will scarcely find it among all the old Heresies. I do not remember it is any of the 88 Heresies cited by *Augustine*, but I am sure a gross Heresie it is. I shall read the Passage to you, out of his *Great Mystery*.

Page 157. And the justification within roots out all Popery and all contradiction, but to speak of justification and sanctification without, and not manifest within, ye are yet in the first Adam in the Popery, (where ye must have a Purgatory to cleanse) and not the righteousness of Christ within, and sanctification and justification [but I know none that speak of a sanctification without, it being generally owned that sanctification is a work or effect of the Holy Spirit wrought in the hearts and Souls of true believers.] Now hear him further and his strange Doctrine, for Abram believed, (and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and his belief was within, and he saw Christ his Glory, and such as believe they come to witness the imputation. But such as come again to witness that they are nearer, then when they did believe, and to witness that they have received Christ within, is the end of their belief, there they witness the righteousness it self without imputation, which is the substance, that which the promise ends in, and all the Fathers hoped for, who stood in the imputation, and all the believers in him. But Christ being come, the end of Mans belief, the righteousness it self. Here is a justification alone without imputation, Christ the righteousness of Gods blessing and Glory for ever. Here Note, these few particulars, Abraham, and all the Fathers stood in the imputation, and hoped for Christ the substance, the righteousness it self, but according to his Doctrine (as it seems) they did not come to it, and so were justified by imputation, without the thing it self, [a very strange Doctrine, what became of them then, when they died, who stood in the imputation, who had not the thing it self. What place of Purgatory, or *limbus patrum*, did they go into when they died? Or what place of Purgatory must these Quakers allow to such now, who stand in the imputation, and dye in that State, and attain not to that high State, to be justified by the thing it self without imputation, according to G. Fox's distinction, I know the Papists do conceit of a *limbus patrum*, but it is not for the reason here given by G. Fox that they stood in the imputation, and were justified by imputation, without the Substance the thing it self, for if G. Fox mean by the Substance the thing it self, the righteousness it self, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Holiness, and the new Birth, and real Sanctification, wrought inwardly by the Spirit of Christ in them, no doubt Abraham, and the believing Fathers had it as much, and much more as any Quaker or other person now can pretend to. Note, 2dly, that he tells of a justification without imputation to some by the thing it self, and of a justification to others by imputation, who were not to come to the thing it self. This I am sure is Forraign Doctrine to Scripture and to all sound Christians, for the justification by the righteousness of Christ imputed to true believers, is a standing thing which the best of Saints always need, if G. Fox thought he needed it not he was in a dangerous condition, and so are all such of his followers, if they think they need it not; and if they be justified without Imputation, then why not also without Faith, and why are they not also now come to the end of their Faith, as well as to the end of imputation, seeing Faith and imputation go together. But this is a high pretence and claim not only higher than Abraham and the Fathers before Christ came in the flesh, but higher than Paul, who said the life that he then lived, was by Faith and we are saved by hope, but hope that is seen is not hope. see more to this purpose, pag. 159. 183. and pag. 228. ad fin. he saith, and Christ in you who is the end of the belief, who is the justification it self, and righteousness it self, nearer then when they did believe, and so here is justification it self without imputation, the righteousness of God, here the belief ends, and all these things are owned according to the Scriptures. But I desire G. Fox's great admirers, and particularly William Penn who hath given him the excellency above them all to shew us what places of Scripture teach us of being justified without imputation, by the thing it self, have not all sincere believers, the thing it self in measure, seeing Faith is the Substance of things hoped for. Heb. 11. 1?

Next to G. F. hear what G. W. hath said of the true and real imputation of righteousness, ye shall see, as he agreeth not with G. Fox about imputation, though both infallible, so he faileth in with that above mentioned Notion of imputed righteousness. i. e. put in men in his Ch. Qu. p. 241.

Quest. 8.

Quest. 8. *What is the true and real imputation of righteousness?* **Ans.** it is the same with justification, (as it relates to Gods reckoning or esteeming that man righteous, that partakes of the everlasting righteousness of Christ through a living Faith in him) and so the same righteousness and holiness of Christ, as inwardly revealed, and brought forth in the new Creature that is made Conformable to his Image, and so all the blessed Fruits and effects of Christs power, and inward Work of righteousness, as the Faith Love, Obedience, Sincerity, Holiness, Integrity of Spirit to God, are acceptable to him accounted of and reckoned unto his People for righteousness, and all still for Christs sake who is the Author and finisher of true, living, saving, justifying Faith.

Again, in pag. 243 of this Book, thus he argueth against Christ his paying the debt of our sins. **Quest. 1.** *Were it reasonable, or true to say, the Creditor has forgiven both the Debt and injury, if it be all paid, and fully punished in the surety?* **Quest. 2.** *Were it justice in the Creditor, to detain the Debtor in prison, If his Debts be all paid by the Surety, or to suffer the Surety to wait long Soliciting, or interceding for his pardon or deliverance.* [Here this ignorant self Conceited Man, who would measure the ways of God by the short span of his Carnal mind may be easily Answered, as to his first Query, it is Answered yea, it is very reasonable, for the free forgiveness of Gods Mercy, and Satisfaction to Divine justice, are very well consistent, even as much as free forgiveness, and Faith and repentance which are the necessary means, whereby to obtain Forgiveness. For it were altogether unsuitable to Gods purity and Holiness to forgive and receive into his Favour, hardened, impenitent Rebellious, and unbelieving Persons while they so remain, and as unsuitable it is that sin be forgiven without the demand of justice be fully Answered, To his 2d. Query, Answer, it is justice in God to detain the Debtor in prison, not finally, but until the time it is fit for him to be set at liberty, and that is the fit time, when the Prisoner has sincerely repented of his sins, and fled to Christ by a living Faith in him in whom he enjoyeth true liberty and Freedom; and a Child well instructed in his Catechism, might have Answered these Objections, which have been well Answered long since, in the Homilies of the Church of England.

Another Author I shall bring to prove this Second Head, is R. Huberthorne a man greatly praised by G. Whitehead, Edw. Burr. and G. Fox, as a deep man in the understanding Spiritual Mysteries, and G. Fox saith of him, he trampled upon all Evil Spirits, and went over them. But I am sure he went over some, he calleth Evil Spirits, very unfairly and foully, by perverting his Opponents words, and asserting gross untruths, whereof I will give you, some taste for a Diversion, I hope ye are not yet weary and that your Ears will not tyre before my Tongue tireth, in his Collection, Pag. 58. he perverteth the words of his Opponent by making him say, *its pity Christ should be the foundation,* and then chargeth him with perverting Pauls words, and speaking his own invention contrary to the Scripture. Now his Opponents words were even as he recites them, *Tis pity Christ should be the foundation, and Word Hey Stubble built thereupon, yet this is possible.* Ye see this is not to say, *its pity Christ should be the Foundation,* for the whole Sentence should be taken together. But to come the matter, this man has yet as strange a Notion of that righteousness, by which the Saints are justified, as any ye have heard, in pag. 134. He chargeth it as a great Error in his Opponent, that he saith, *Christs righteousness, which justifies a believing sinner, is not the essential righteousness of his Godhead,* here (saith R. Hub.) *he hath spoken ignorantly, and held forth, as if there is two righteousnesses, of Christ, which I call for a proof from him for else let him confess to his shame, that he added to the Scripture, for the righteousness of Christ is but one, by which all the Saints are justified.* Now what the two righteousnesses of Christ are, which his Opponent affirmed and he denied, hear how he Quoteth his Opponent pag. 210. p. 2. That there are two righteousnesses of Christ, the one without the Saints, to justify them, and the other within the Saints to Sanctifie them. He roundly Answers him, *Christs righteousness is but one, and that by which they were both sanctified and justified wth but one thing, even the Spirit of our God,*—And if Christ was in them, his righteousness was in them,

or else he and his righteousness is divided. Thus ye see he leaves no room for justification by the righteousness and obedience of the Man Christ performed by him for us in the true nature of man, or by his death, and blood shed for us, that by which the Saints are justified is but one thing, and that is the Spirit of God, and the Essential righteousness of the God-head, which *pag. 211.* he calls an *infinite righteousness in us*. This vile Heresie of the Saints being justified by the Essential righteousness of the God-head, was refuted long ago by *Bellarmino*, and also by Protestant Authors, and is easily refuted, for if Men, as suppose these *Quakers* be justified by the Essential righteousness of the God-head, then they are equally righteous as God is as amply, and equally righteous for his Essential righteousness is infinite, is himself, as his Essential wisdom is himself. But seeing by *R. Hubberthorne*, there is but one righteousness, by which the Saints are justified, and that is Gods Essential righteousness, how doth this agree with *G. Whiteheads* Doctrine of Justification by an inward work of righteousness wrought in Men, for any inward work of righteousness wrought by the Spirit of God in Men, is a thing done in time, that had a beginning, and therefore cannot be the Essential righteousness of God, that was before all time, without beginning or end; thus ye may see how these infallible Men, who are said to be the same, yet are not the same, but differ widely in their wild, and absurd Antichristian Notions, about one of the great Fundamentals of the Christian Faith. And *G. Whiteheads* Notion, in Answer to *T. Danson* is as absurd as that of *Ric. Hubb.* that the *righteousness which Christ works in the Saints is infinite, because God who works it is infinite*, for this is to say there are two infinities, and that is to say there are two Gods. *T. Elwood* useth a piece of very dull Sophistry in excusing *G. Whiteheads* ignorance, that *G. Whiteheads* words were a Deduction or Inference from *T. Dansons* affirmation, who had laid down that the *righteousness whereof Christ is the subject and that whereof he is the efficient are of one kind*. And this also he thinks loseth the Contradiction betwixt *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*, but all in vain, for 1. Whatever Inference *G. W.* made from *T. Dansons* words, the Inference is really *G. Whiteheads*, which Inference he Labours to prove, but most ignorantly and Falsely, from these Arguments, *as because God Works it in us, and it is Christ formed in us, and Christ is infinite*. But Secondly, *G. Whiteheads* Inference from *T. Dansons* words is False and Idle, for *T. Danson* said truly, that *righteousness whereof Christ is the subject, and that whereof he is the efficient are of one kind*, to wit in the Man Christ, for the Godhead can be no Subject of Reception, though he is the Efficient Cause of all righteousness wrought either in the Man Christ, or in any of the Saints, nothing done in time, can be in God, as a Subject of Reception, for that were to say, he is Changeable; Now that righteousness which is wrought in the Man Christ, though a high righteousness is not Infinite, because it had a beginning in time, nor is the Birth or Formation of Christ in the Saints, an Infinite thing, for that were still to make two Gods, [as Christs Formation, in the Flesh, and his true Nature as Man, was not, nor is not Infinite, and so to affirm is the *Eutichian* Heresie, condemned by the Scriptures, and all Orthodox Christians.]

And here I see it needful to acquaint you, of a great fallacy used by many of the Teachers among the People called *Quakers*, who have led many of the poor ignorant People into the same: When they have been asked, if they believe to be justified by the righteousness of Christ, or by their own righteousness, they Answer readily, *by the righteousness of Christ* but not by any righteousness of their own. Now the fallacy lyes here that by the righteousness of Christ they mean, that which they work or produce by the Spirit of Christ in them, this they say is not their righteousness, but Christs and Gods righteousness, and because it is Gods and Christs, therefore it is every way perfect, and can have no sinful defect. But to detect this Fallacy, I say, any righteousness that the Saints effect by the help of the Spirit of God in them, though in a Sense it is Gods because he is the Prime or Principal Efficient of it, yet it is theirs also, because as they are Secondary Efficients of it, so they are the only Subjects of Reception,

to it is theirs both Effectively and Subjectively. Now, according to a true Maxim in Physicks and Metaphisicks, *bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quolibet defectu*, an effect perfectly good that hath no mixture of Evil and imperfection, must come from all its Causes being perfect, but if one most perfect Cause, and another somewhat imperfect Cause, joyn together to produce an effect, that effect shall have some imperfection. And thus God, and the Soul acting together, the Soul that is the Secondary Efficient having the least sinful imperfection, as for the Example in an Act of Faith, or love to God, are there not many Holy Souls that yet are not so Holy, but they have sinful defects and imperfections which weaken them, and hinder them, so that though they sincerely believe in God, love him and obey him, yet their Faith, love and obedience is short of what the perfect purity and extent of Gods Law requires. Who of us can say, we love him as much as we ought, or need to love him.

I shall now come to the 3d. and 4th. Heads, and give you some new Proofs of them, *that the bodies of the Saints that dye, rise not again, or which is equivalent that the deceased Saints do not yet hope for the Resurrection of their Bodies?*

For Proof of this, I shall Read you a Passage out of the above mentioned Author, so highly commended by G. F. and G. W. in his Collections, pag. 121.— *And these are they that plead for a life in sin while they are here, and that say, that the Saints Glorified in Heaven, do yet hope for the Resurrection of their Bodies and so not come to the end of their hope, though in Heaven, when as the Saints upon earth, witnessed the end of their hope the Salvation of their Souls. Now these may well deny perfection on earth who deny it in Heaven, which the Saints, we and the Scriptures do witness it in both, and against all such, who are not fit to speak of the things of God. Again, to this same purpose in pag. 119. And his envy hath reached to Heaven, to prove that the Saints in Heaven are not perfect but wait for the redemption of their Bodies, which now if People mind the Scripture, there is no such Doctrine in it, as the Saints in Heaven have not received the redemption of their Bodies. So ye see, he makes it to contradict the Scripture that the Saints in Heaven do yet hope for the Resurrection of their Bodies, for he saith, the Saints and we i. e. the Quakers witness it in both, to wit both in Heaven, and on Earth, therefore it is clear it was his Sense that the Saints perfection on Earth was the Resurrection of their Bodies, or at leastwise did necessarily infer it, as a thing already witnessed.*

This same Author Answereth to some Queries, concerning the two Seeds, and their Resurrection, as if there were no Resurrection, but of Christ the good Seed, and that of the Devil the bad Seed in Men. Page 275. It may be worth the while to hear his strange Answers to those Queries, which as they plainly overthrow the Doctrine of the Resurrection, so they most grossly by a most perverse Allegory, Hold Forth most unsound Doctrine concerning Christ.

The Questions and Answers by Ric. Hubb. are as followeth,

Thou declarest thy ignorance of the two Seeds, and askest what be those two Seeds. Answer, Those two the Scriptures speaks of, the Seed of the Woman, and the Seed of the Serpent. Quest. 2. Who did or doth sow them two Seeds? Answer, God doth Sow the one, and the Wicked one the other. Quest. 3. Where be they Sown? Answer, In Man. Quest. 4. When be they Sown? Answer, When Man had a being and a Body to receive them. Quest. 5. What be the Bodies they shall rise with? Answer, Their own Bodies according to their own Natures, the one pure, and the other defiled. Quest. 6, Whether be these two Seeds, and two Bodies in all the world, or two Seeds in every man, and the two Bodies in every man? Answer, The Seeds are but two in the whole World, having each Seed its own Body, and in every one, until the one be cast out. Quest. 7. When shall those Seeds arise, or be raised, whether after the Bodily death, or after the Spiritual death? Answer, Every one in its own order after the death of that which is born after the Flesh, and also after the Death of the Spiritual wickedness, which is yet alive in all Hirelings and Deceivers, (such as thou art) where the Seed of God is yet in its Grave. Quest. 8. What are the Graves those are in, and out of which they shall arise? Answer, These

These of which the Scripture speaks, which when thou comest to understand it, thou wilt understand both the Seeds and Graves of which we speak, Christ the Seed made his Grave in the wicked, and in the Rich in his Death, and out of that Grave shall rise with his Body, into Everlasting Life, If thou canst receive it thou mayst be satisfied. And as to the 9th. Query, why I say, that the one shall rise into Everlasting Life, and the other unto Condemnation. *Ans. Because it is so, therefore I say so, and if I say to the contrary make it manifest, but in this, as in other things, thy folly and ignorance is manifest, &c.* Here ye See, he owns no Resurrection but of the two Seeds, none of which are Men, but Men are the ground in which they are Sown, and the Graves in which they are buried, but he has not told us, how the Serpents seed is buried in wicked Men, for it is rather raised in them, than buried, If it be said, it is buried in good men, then how shall it be raised up in them, to Condemnation? Did ye ever hear such stuff! But he grossly perverts the Scripture in *Isaiah 53.* by a most false Allegory, that Christ made his Grave in the wicked, and in the Rich in his Death, there is no such Translation, nor will the Hebrew bear it, he made his Grave with the wicked, &c. It was a Prophecy, that Christ should be buried with the wicked, to wit the two Thieves, and how that Rich man Joseph of Arimathea, should lay him in his own Sepulcher, as was fulfilled, and near to the same Place, the two Thieves. (whereof the one had repented) were Buried. Let me in the next Place Read unto you some abominable Queries, of his opposing the Man Christ his being Created. pag. 49. 'When was that Christ Created, which you say, must as a Creature judge the world; and if in *Maries* time, who was judge of the World till then, or did he judge the World as God till then, and as a Creature ever since. Whether was not that Christ, which you call a Creature sent out of Heaven from the Father, and did he send a Creature to Redeem the Creation, and Judge it. And a little after he Quereth, was not the person of Christ Jesus before the world was, his Nature and Glory the same, that is now with the Father in Heaven, or in what is it changed. And when had the Man Christ Jesus his beginning, if you can declare it. pag. 50. How is Christ the only begotten Son of God. If he be a Creature, or how can God beget a Creature, and if the whole person of Christ was not before the earthly Adam, how was the Creation made by him. Here observe they are blind that see not how this man maketh Christ to be only God; and Confounds the Godhead of Christ with his Manhood, seeing he will not allow the Man Christ to have been Created or to have had any beginning, pleading that the person of Christ Jesus was before the World was, yea his whole Person before the Earthly Adam was. Now seeing nothing can dye but what is Created it is plain by *R. Hubberthorns* sense, that the man Christ never dyed, and to believe he dyed, according to him is false Doctrine. This vile Antichristian Error that the man Christ is not a Creature, nor Created, *T. Elwood* defendeth, and Argueth after the same manner, if Christ be a Creature then he is not God, and if generated, or by generation, then not created, Arguing from his Generation in the Womb of the Virgin. See his Answer to my Narrative. pag. 227. and Truth def. p. 139. where from my saying, Christ was the Son of God by an Eternal Generation and the Son of Abraham by a Generation in the fulness of time, he Concludes, so that in each respect and under each denomination, he is by Generation, and would he have him be Created also, only that he might render him a meer Socinian Creature, herein (not S. C. but) G. K. is condemnable. But let us See how this man agreeth with *W. B.* as the one makes the person of Christ, his whole person only to be God, the other makes him not only a Man but such a Person, as was mean and contemptible, as the Persons of his Brethren, for hear him thus, Pag. 307. 'For they (viz. his Disciples) loved his person, for the sake of the Frame, and quality of the Spirit, that dwelt in him, or else what was his Person (being mean and contemptible) to them, more then another person, but for that which dwelt in him, they loved him, let none mistake, I do not sleight it, nor the person of any of his Brethren, or Children, as they are prepared to do the will of their Father. Let all that have the least Measure of the true Knowledge of Christ,

Christ, judge if this be not most unworthily and irreverently Written, concerning our Lords Person, it was not only more in it self, then the Persons of any others but it was more to his Disciples, incomparably, who saw his Glory, his very outward and Visible Person being Miraculously Conceived by the Power of the Holy Ghost, and his Flesh, nor Soul was ever Tainted with the left sinful defilement, the Vessel that was to receive such an incomparable Treasure, (all the fulness of Grace and Truth that dwelt in him) behoved to be incomparably more excellent then that of other men, even the best, of whom that may be duly applied every way, *thou art fairer then the Sons of Men: grace is poured into thy lips, Psal. 45. 2.*

I Come now to give you some New Proofs on the 4th. Head, to wit that Christ is not to come without us to Judge the Quick and the Dead, in his glorified Body even the same that formerly Suffered Death for our sins.

For Proof of this, I shall Read to you a Passage in the abovementioned Author, *R. Hubb. Coll. p. 56.* His Opponent had said, *let them (viz. the Saints) not go forth, before the time, but abide in new Testament Worship, till the Lord come in Person, and call them out, and then they shall go out all together.* For these sound and inoffensive words, hear how he takes him up. *Ans. How many Souls hast thou led into that pit of darkness and blindness, as to believe that Christ is yet to come in person.* Now the Scripture which thou bringest, *Mat. 24. 27.* Proves no such thing, *as another Christ coming in Person.* Observe how he perverts his Opponents words, as if he held Forth another Christ coming in Person, thus as *G. Fox* Commends him, he trampled upon the Spirit of his Opponent, and went over him, but ye see very foully and unfairly it was never heard that any who expects Christs coming in Person to judge the quick and the dead, at the great day, did expect another Christ coming in Person, but another appearance of that same Christ who first came in a State of Humiliation, and is again to come in a State of glorious Exaltation. And this *R. Hubb.* Boldly gives the Lye to the Apostles Doctrine, affirming (but most falsely) *they did never tell of Christs second coming in Person, nor of his Personal Reign,* whereas the Apostles Doctrine is full and clear concerning it and all Orthodox Christians in the whole World believe it, and affirm that Christ when he comes in Person to judge the World, his so judging is his Act, as a King, and may well be called his Personal Reign (not to meddle at present with the Thousand Years Reign) as it *Mat. 25. 34.* *Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, and verse 40. And the King shall answer, &c. and verse 31. This King is the Son of Man.*

For another Proof on this 4th. Head, I shall Read to you a Passage out of *W. Bailie* his *Coll. pag. 306.* *I never read in all the Scriptures (as I can remember) of a Third coming of Christ, Personally, in his own single Person, or of a Personal Reign, besides what shall be in his Saints, But I have read of his coming the second time, without sin unto Salvation, &c. Which the Apostles in their days did witness.* And *pag. 309.* *Who (viz. the Disciples) never mentioned, (as ever I read) of a Personal coming, and Reign the Third time, or of a Third coming in a single Personal appearance, as hath been imagined by many, &c. Again in pag. 300.* *But methinks I hear some say, (in their Reasonings and imaginations) what body hath he, and where is it seeing it is said, he is at the right hand of God.* This I shall ans. with his own words, which he spake here on Earth, *viz. No man ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, the Son of Man, which is in Heaven, He that hath an Ear to hear, let him hear, and take Notice what body that was, which came down from Heaven, when Mary said unto the Angel, how can this be, seeing I know not a man.*

Is not this abominable? By his plain words, no body did Ascend to Heaven, but that body which came down from Heaven, here he Falsifieth and Perverteth our Saviours words, who said not body but he. Our Saviours words prove no such thing, for though another he, or another Christ did not Ascend, but who did Descend, yet he took of the Virgins Substance, of her real Body, otherwise he could not be in Heaven, in the true

Nature.

Nature of Man, the Son of Man. See again how he Allegorizeth away the Cloud that received Christs body out of the sight of his Disciples, into the Cloud of sin, not owning any other Cloud. pag. 301. But indeed saith, *W. Bailie It is but a Cloud that hath received him out of the sight of the Gazers, but saith the Lord to his Children, I have blotted out your iniquities like a thick Cloud.* I shall yet bring you another Proof out of *Francis Hugel* a great Author among them, who contendeth against his Opponent for saying that *Christ is in the earth by his Spirit and in Heaven, in his Body or Person, distinct from his Spirit if so (saith he) then you divide Christ, and a Person without a Spirit and not Christ.* Now if Christ be not in Heaven, in his body or Person, distinct from his Spirit in believers, but so that where ever his Spirit is, there is his Body, this cuts off all of Faith and Expectation of Christs outward coming in Person. But how weakly doth he Argue against his Opponent, it doth not follow that Christ is a Person without a Spirit, because as his Opponent saith, and as all Orthodox Christians say, *Christs body is not on earth, but his Spirit,* for they who affirm Christs Body to be in Heaven, affirm that his Soul and Spirit is there, but not Limited not to be in Believers on Earth also, nor will it prove a division betwixt Christs Spirit and his Body, that Christs Spirit is not Circumscribed as his Body is, but as it replenisheth his Body with its fulness, so with several Measures it replenisheth the hearts of the Faithful on Earth.

Before I have done with my new Proofs, I will give you another Diversion by the way, it was *Francis Hugel* whom the Author of the Snake Quotes, to prove that he held a most blasphemous Assertion, viz. *that they that have the Spirit of God are equal with God,* First I shall read to you *Francis Hugel's* words. pag. 232. *And the first thing that thy dark mind stumbles at, is, that some have said, that they that have the Spirit of God, are equal with God. He that hath the Spirit of God, (saith Francis Hugel) is in that which is equal, as God is equal, and his ways equal, and he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit, there is unity, and the unity stands in equality it self. He that is born from above is the Son of God and he said, I and my Father are one. And where the Son is revealed, and speaks the Father speaks in him, and dwells in him, and he in the Father, in that which is equal, in equality it self, there is equality in nature, though not in Stature, Go Learn what these things mean, the understanding and Learned well know, what I say, and this is neither damnable nor blasphemous, but on the contrary it is saving and precious to them?* Now hear with what dull and palpable Sophistry. *G. Whitehead* labours to justify, *F. Hou.* He saith, *Antidote*, pag. 260. He places the Equality, between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Doth he? Is that *F. Hougils* only meaning of these words? *they that have the Spirit of God, are equal with God,* how improper is it to say, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are equal with God, this were to make them not Three, but Four. But again, *how are the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, equal not in Stature, but in Nature,* was it ever heard before in Christendom to distinguish betwixt Gods Nature and Stature, as to say, the Father and the Son, are equal in Nature, but not in Stature, O shameful perversion of *G. Whitehead,* to defend the vile ignorance and Error of *F. Hougil!* lest their pretence and Claim to infallibility should fall among their ignorant admirers, can it be thought that *G. W.* is honest and sincere in this way of perversion and Sophistry? Again, he saith, *Now though the Saints cannot claim to themselves that equality, the Son of God (who is their head) hath, yet who can in truth deny, their being made partakers of the divine nature, and union in Christ Jesus and Holy Spirit with the Father.* But what saith all this to prove the Saints equal with God in Nature, but not in Stature. the highest equality is the equality of Nature, seeing Gods Stature and Nature is one and the same thing. But observe again a little piece of silly Craft that *G. W.* useth in his *Antidote* he saith, we (meaning himself and his Brethren) give this Person, (viz. the Author of the Snake, &c) leave to secure such Persons in *Bedlam*, if he can find any among us, that he can plainly prove, to hold the same as he charges. It was reported of *G. F.* that he said, *he was equal with God, and in Sauls Errand,* he said, pag. 8. *He that*

that hath the same Spirit that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead is equal with God as Jesus Christ which is the Mystery hath passed before, so the same Spirit takes upon it the same seed, and is the same where it is made manifest. Now both G. F. and F. Hare Deceased and are not to be found to be sent to Bedlam, for ye will not say, their Bodies are to be taken up out of their Graves, but G. Whiteheads words imply, that when they were Living, they were fitter for Bedlam, than a Christian Society, that Held such Doctrine, viz. that the Saints (such as they judged themselves to be,) were equal with God. And that this was as much G. Fox's sense as F. Hougels is proved from his Answer in Great Mystery, pag. 197. to his Opponent Expounding that place in Mat. Be ye therefore perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect, that is in quality not in quantity, to this, G. Fox roundly Answereth, He that is perfect as his Heavenly Father is perfect, is perfect, as he is perfect, if thou or any have an Ear to hear let them hear, and lay away thy qualities and quantities, and take the words as they are, and all that are come into Christ, are come into Life from the Dust and Ashes, and are the Spiritual Men. This he spoke, blaming his Opponent for calling the Saints Dust and Ashes, but was not Abraham a Saint, and come into Life, and into Christ, and yet called himself Dust and Ashes before God. Also in Sauls Errand hear what Answ. G. Fox gave to that Query, pag. 13. whether the Saints in this Life, without any addition hereafter, are perfectly just, perfectly Holy, completely Glorious in this Life, and are not capable of any addition after Death, in the left degree, but only of Manifestation. He Answers, Thou Hypocrit dissemble not with him, he that is perfectly Holy, is perfectly just, where this is revealed, there needs no addition, for the man of God is perfect. [Note, what is this but to make themselves equal with God, for God only needs no addition. Again, If the Saints be completely glorious in this Life, that they need no addition, after Death, then they have no Resurrection, to look after, nor outward coming of Christ to expect.]

I intend to bring one Proof more on the 2d. Head, but because the day is Hot, if the Auditory be willing, to Adjourn the Meeting until the Third hour in the Afternoon, I shall be satisfied, to which they Generally gave assent, and thus the First Meeting ended about the First Hour in the Afternoon.

At the Third hour in the Afternoon, I proceeded to bring another Proof out of G. Fox to show his strange Doctrine concerning the Flesh and blood of Christ, what that Flesh is, which he calls the Offering, and what the blood is, in which is the belief that takes away the sin. I quoted this Passage in the Appendix to my Narrative, to which T. Elwood hath said nothing by way of Direct reply, but tells he had not seen the Book and Queries was not that his outward flesh that was Crucified, and how Faithfully I recite out of it, he knows not. But the Book is frequent enough, and is in divers hands, what I recited out of it, was Faithfully done, only a Literal Fault in the Typography, as for read it was Printed read. Now that it could not be the outward Flesh, that G. Fox meant in all that large relation, is evident, because he saith, Christ according to the flesh was Crucified, when Adam sinned, and Adams and Eves flesh was defiled, I shall recite his words now a little more largely than in the former Narrative. He begins thus. Concerning Christs flesh, which was offered, &c. Christ the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World, when it began its Foundation, then the Lamb was slain, then the World was set up in Mans heart, that he did not see the beginning nor the ending of the Works of God, and then Adam and Eves clean flesh was defiled, and clean bodies, and clean minds, when they transgressed and transgressions entred, so came sin into Adam, and Eve, and then the body of death made up in the sin and transgression, in Adams flesh, and Eves, then were their minds defiled, and their Spirits and their Souls came into death, and their flesh defiled, then came their understanding to be darkned, and Christ according to the flesh Crucified, the Lamb slain, that flesh of his, which is a Mystery when the first Adams and Eves flesh was defiled, and so death reigned from Adam to Moses; and when the Jews did transgress the Law of God, the Prophets told them, they oppressed the seed as a Cart with Sheaves.

and

and likewise the Prophets did see Christ, which had been slain from the Foundation of the World, and bruised which Moses, David, Abraham, and the rest of the Prophets saw, that he was to rise, that God would raise him up, who should come in the end of the Book, that is in the end of the words, in the end of the Prophets, in the end of the Types, Figures and Shadows—
 pag. 56. So the belief comes into this righteousness, Christ the Seed, for the other righteousness was held in the clean part, in which was the offering, so he ends and puts down that righteousness, who is the righteousness and that part, and mind and Eye hat stands in it that they may come to a thing, that is lower and under, and higher, and over all, and before all, that is the righteousness it self, so in this lyes the belief, so then in the life and in the substance, and in the end of all Types—
 pag. 57. So through his flesh, he doth reconcile, and by the Offering up his body, his flesh, that which hath been slain from the Foundation of the World, and yet never corrupted—which flesh is the offering, for as he was God he did not dye, and this flesh is a Mystery, and in this flesh, is the belief that takes away the sin, that never corrupted, that is the Offering for sin, and the blood of this Flesh cleanseth from sin. pag. 58. Now they that are in the belief of this flesh, and Offering, sees over all Offerings to the beginning into the Glory, which was with the Father, before the World began, for all outward Offerings and Sacrifices was given to Man, after he fell, and the Lamb slain, which Offering is a Figure of Christ, the Seed to be brought forth, and offered up, and he the top-stone over all laid, to end and finish all the outward Offerings, and Types and Shadows, and in him there is none. pag. 59. So through this Offering is the reconciliation, through the Offering of his flesh that never corrupted, but takes away Corruptions, and his blood cleanseth from Corruptions, the life read and so this pure flesh, this Offering is set over all, which never Corrupted, which must be your Meat if you Live though there is more in all these things which is hard to be uttered and cannot be uttered yet?

Did ye ever hear such Doctrine. This that I have Read Proves that in all this, he doth not mean his outward flesh, For 1. This Flesh was Crucified and slain from the beginning, so was not his outward flesh, (though the great benefit and vertue of his Death, and Sufferings in the Flesh, when he Suffered in the fulness of time did extend to all Ages, from the beginning of the World, and will to all Ages to come to the end of the World, in which sense he may be said to be the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World. 2. His outward flesh was an outward Offering, but this is the inward that (as he saith) endeth all the outward Offerings. 3. It is the Substance, the Life, the Righteousness it self, the Seed that which was Bruised and slain in the Jews, and oppressed as a Cart with Sheaves. 4. It is a thing that is lower and under, and higher and over all, and before all, therefore not the outward Flesh of Christs body which was visible, and was not before all, nor above all, unless they will say, that the Seed or Light within was Transfused or changed into an outward Body of Flesh, as Mugleton, and his followers are said to Teach, which is abominable!

But how little weight G. Fox did lay on Christs outward Suffering, or the Faith of it (though he mentions in one place, some that were such, as Crucified him without them, that slay Christ in themselves. pag. 58.) clearly appeareth from the Objection he brings against his Doctrine here delivered. *Obiect.* But if any should hold the Seed only within them, and that Christ is not come in the Flesh, and hath not appeared in the shape of a Man, to end all the Offerings, and Sacrifices and Typical things, and the Offerer, and the part that doth pertain to them.

To this Objection, the true Christian Answer should have been, that such who hold that Christ is not come in the flesh, are but unbelieving Jews and Infidels, and such Antichrists, as John wrote of, who are not of God. 1. Joh. 4. 2. Every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God, &c. But in place of such an Answer as that, he replyeth, Answer they must that hold that that, he is not come, but only is within them the Seed, then see if that they speak of, doth, or hath brought them out of Adam in the Fall, and put down all Adams and Eves Sons and Daughters inventions, &c. And this is the substance of his Answer, whereby is implied that they who hold the Seed only within them, and that Christ is not come in the
 Flesh,

Flesh, such as the Infidel *Jews*, and the Deists here in *England* and elsewhere yet by the Seed within them, without Faith in Christ without them, they may be brought to a sinless State, which in his Phrase is to be brought out of *Adam* in the Fall.

Having thus gone through my new proofs, out of the abovementioned Authors I come now, to show, the weakness, and palpable Sophistry of *G. Whiteheads* Defences and *T. Elwoods* to my former Proofs, brought in my Former *Narrative* in many particulars so far as time shall permit, though it cannot be expected, that I can go through all, yet what remains being of the like Nature, ye may judge of the one by the other.

G. Whitehead in his *Antidote*, pag. 28. chargeth me with undervaluing the *Light within* as not sufficient to Salvation, or not sufficient without something else. *Answer*. Here he hath clearly given away the Cause in Controversie betwixt *T. Elwood* and me in Contradiction to *T. Elwood* his advocate, who greatly blamed me, (but most unjustly) for mistaking the Question, and cunningly (as he saith) *sliding* in the word *within* as in his pretended Answer to my *Narrative*. pag. 183. and in his further Discovery. pag. 31, 32. as if the Question had not been about the sufficiency of the *Light within*, but the *Light* indefinitely, which signifieth Christ both without and within. But I brought Authentick Proofs, that the Question betwixt them in *America* and me, was about the *Light within*, and not the *Light* indefinitely. And now *G. Whitehead* hath eased me of any further Labour to Convince *T. Elwood*, that it was the *Light within*, concerning which the Controversie was, by his fairly granting that they, i. e. the *Quakers* of his party, are offended at my undervaluing the *Light within*, as not sufficient to Salvation, or not sufficient without something else. And here now at length, he hath openly shewn his Deisme and *Antichristian* Doctrine, for if it be an offensive and false Assertion, to say, the *light within* is not sufficient to Salvation, without something else, the contradictory must be true, that the *light within* is sufficient to Salvation without anything else, (the true contradiction lying betwixt, the one Particular, and the other universal) and so without Christs blood outwardly shed, and his Sacrifice on the Cross, and intercession for us in Heaven, all which are something else than the *light within* Men. But his Arguments for the sufficiency of the *Light within* without any thing else, are exceeding weak and Sophistical as that *Christ within* and *Christ without* are not two Christs, *Christ without* is not another Christ, than *Christ within*, the *Light within* is not divided from *Christ without*, and God and *Christ* the Eternal and Essential word is all-sufficient, and able to save Man from Sin, Wrath, and Damnation. For though *Christ within* and *Christ without* are not two Christs, as his Godhead and Manhood are not two Christs, yet his Manhood is not his Godhead, but something else, and his Body of Flesh, and his Blood outwardly shed, are something else than the *light within*, and if any should argue against *G. W.* and say, God and *Christ* without us, without any internal illumination, or operation, of him within us, is sufficient to Salvation, how will *G. W.* Answer? God is as truly God, without us as within us, and yet he will not only grant, but plead, that there is an absolute necessity of an inward Work of God in Mens hearts, to Sanctifie them, without which they cannot be saved, and though God, and *Christ* are all-sufficient, yet as they cannot lye, nor sin, nor be the Author of sin, so nor can they do any thing that doth not agree to the Divine attributes of his wisdom, and justice, nor can God, who is all-sufficient contradict his Eternal purpose, and ordination, which was and is to save us by the man *Christ Jesus*, and not without him. And would *G. W.* think it enough in any that should say, it is sufficient to Preach *Christ* without for Salvation, and his Death and Sufferings without any thing or Principle within, because by his Argument, they are not divided. But though *Christ* is not divided, yet too many have False Notions of him, as if he were divided. Hence as some Preach *Christ* without, but deny or oppose him within, and blaspheme against his inward appearance, so others Preach him within, but deny or oppose yea, and blaspheme against his outward appearance and his real existence in the true Nature of man without us, and his outward coming to judge the World, as is already showed. But *G. W.* it seems hath now found

a Sophistical way to excuse those Blasphemers against Christ without, Why? Christ within, and Christ without are not divided, and if this can excuse them, who make Christ within, the all and whole of the worlds Saviour, it can as much excuse them, who make Christ without Men, the whole Saviour excluding the Spirit and inward appearance of Christ in Men. But *G. W.* hath not proved, that I undervalue the *light within* as I do not but highly value it, and acknowledge all that is due thereunto as a concurring Cause of our Salvation jointly with the *Man Christ*, but not without him. Whereas *G. W.* saith in his *Antidote*, we (*i. e.* he and his Brethren) are not offended at *G. Keiths* Preaching Christ, or his Suffering and Dying without us *truly considered*, there lyeth a Mystery in that Phrase truly Considered, *i. e.* to Preach Christs Suffering and Dying without us, and the Faith of it, not as absolutely necessary, but as profitable, or as necessary, in such a manner, as an upper Garment is necessary to keep a man from Cold, though he can do well enough without it, if he have an under Garment, or as a pair of Gloves is necessary to a Mans Hands to keep them Warm, though he can do without them, by putting his Hands into his Pockets, which very Examples some of the *Quakers* have brought to show how far they understand that Christ without, and the Faith of him is necessary to be Preached. But this is down-right *Pelagianisme*, for *Pelagius* himself used such an Example, to show, how far Christ was necessary to Mens Salvation, as when a Man can go from one Place to another on Foot, but Travelleth more easily on Horseback, or in a Chariot, and this amounts to *G. Whiteheads* way of Preaching Christ truly Considered, for if the *light within* be sufficient to Salvation without any thing else, it's a necessary consequence there is no absolute or indeed no great need to Preach any thing at all of a Christ without.

Antidote, pag. 30. All Christs Sufferings and Sacrifice, his Cross, his Blood and water shed without, had a Mysterious and Allegorical meaning and interpretation, as well as a Literal in them. [And there is his Spiritual blood and water as well as the outward, for all that is spoken of the blood of Christ in Scripture is not to be taken only in a Literal Sense. See also pag. 82.]

Ans. That by Christs blood outwardly shed, is meant not only his blood, but his Death and Sufferings of the whole Man, by a Figurative Speech of putting the part for the whole, is true, but that all Christs Sufferings and Sacrifice, Cross, Blood, Water, had an Allegorical Sense and meaning, besides the Literal, *i. e.* what is really intended by the Literal Declaration, is False, and the bottom of it is *Ranterisme*, and wild Notion and Fancy, for if Christs Sufferings and Sacrifice have an Allegorical sense and meaning, this is still to make them but Types and Figures of a more excellent Suffering and Sacrifice of the *light within Men*, seeing the thing to which the Allegorye, or Allegorical Sense points, is the more excellent, as the New Covenant is more excellent, then *Sarab*, the Allegorie of it.

Page 58. They place not infallibility in ever single Quaker. *Ans.* This doth not clear them from holding Popish infallibility, for no more do the Papis place infallibility in every single Papis. But let *G. W.* Answer, doth not he think himself infallible? What instance of his infallibility hath he owned, and doth he not think the Yearly Meeting at London is infallible? Let him not equivocate but speak plainly out, yea, or nay.

Page 109. He unfairly and strainedly defends *G. Fox's* words, there is none have a Glory and a Heaven but within them, which was before man had a being. Great Mystery, pag. 214. This (saith *G. W.*) is intended of what the Saints have and enjoy in this life in the present Sense, (and not of that more full attainment in that which is to come,) for *G. F.* said in his *Sauls Errand*, they that are perfect, need no addition, after this life. And even in the present time, the Saints on Earth, have a Glory, and a Heaven, without them, as really as Governour Penn hath *Pensilvania*, though he is not now in it; and if any would say, Governour Penn hath not *Pensilvania*, it is not his, because he is not in it, but here in *England*, the *Quakers* would say, he lyed.

Page 188. He saith he is still dissatisfied with the word Co-creator, as implying two Gods, for he saith, *Co* signifies *simul* together, as Coworkers, Copartners, and to help him, he brings in his *Moderate Churchman*, saying it being a word neither used in the Holy Scriptures, nor by any of the Antient Counsels. *Ans.* That *Co* or *Con* that signify *simul* together, doth imply two Gods, is both weakly and Sophistically Argued, and his *Moderate Church-man*, and he Writ ignorantly, it is used in the Holy Scriptures, by the Greek Septuagint who were wiser men, then either *G. W.* or his *Church-man* Prov. 8. 27, 31. where the eternal wisdom is brought in, saying *συμπαράμυνη* and *συσχεύεται* i. e. I was *Coeexistent* and *Coefficient*, which is as much as *Cocreans*, i. e. *Co-creating*. And seeing *G. W.* layeth his so great offence on the word *Co* as signifying *simul* together, and thinks himself bravely defended by his *moderate Church-man*, his telling, that it is not used by any of the Antient Counsels, is he so ignorant, that he knoweth not that Antient Counsels used the word *Homoufios*, i. e. *Consubstantial*, and by *G. Whiteheads* Logick, *Consubstantial* implies two Gods, as well as *Co-creator*, is it not a great shame that any professed Church of England Man, should thus defend a vile Error, Contradicting one of the great Essentials of the Church of Englands Faith? But how doth *G. W.* or his *moderate Church-man* defend or excuse his blaming *W. Burnet* for saying that Christ as God had a Father: This was the main Argument I brought against *G. W.* to prove that he did not believe that the Son of God was God, for he called it Nonsense and blasphemy to say, that Christ God, had a Father. Now if he had no Father, as he was God, he was either the Father himself, which was the *Sabellian* Heresie, or if he was not God, as he was the Son, he was but a meer Creature. But this though it was the main Charge he past over without the least reply. And further to show his ignorance he Translates *τρεῖς μαρτυροῦντες* three Witnesses, which should be Translated three Witnessing, for the word is an Adjective, and a Participle, and surely they Witness together: and if he grants that there are three witnessing, why not also three Creating, and yet but one God?

Page 190. He saith, Suppose that in some passages, in some of my former Writings, as to the Circumstance of words or expressions there may be some deficiency or want some Explication, or distinction. *Ans.* This is a bare acknowledgment. Suppose that in some passages, &c. It is beyond supposition, that he hath greatly erred in things of great moment, 2. If words be but a circumstance, why has he and his Brethren so much blamed their Opponents about these circumstances, and why have they blamed me for circumstances of words, and why do they bring up against me what I wrote, in my younger Years, much younger then *G. W.* was then. But unsound words eat as a Canker that destroyeth the Faith.

Page 191. He saith, *Christ as God his Soul was increated*, Note his and *T. Elwoods* dull Sophistry, there was no Question betwixt *T. Danfon* and *G. W.* about the Soul of Christ, as God, but about the Soul and Body of Christ as Man, for *T. D.* had said, *Christ had a Created Soul and Body*, it was never known that *T. Danfon*, or any other Presbyterian held that Christ as God had a Created Soul and Body.

Page 192. These are to tell the World, that we own no Christ at all and he chargeth me that he is perswaded, *G. K.* has wronged his own Conscience, and that he must needs know the contrary of him, in this, and some other things. *Ans.* I reject his Charge as altogether False, my Conscience hath not the least hurt in the Case, until *G. W.* retract his vile errors most unchristianly opposing and Disputing one while against Christ as God having a Father, and being *Cocreator* with the Father, another while opposing his having a Created Soul and Body, or any bodily existence now in Heaven, as Man, he leaves just Cause of suspicion in the minds of all Conscientious Persons, that he doth not truly believe that Christ is either God or Man. If *G. W.* be better instructed of later Years, let him Retract his former Errors, otherwise who can think well of him? And what if some among you, hold that Christ is neither God nor Man, it well enough agrees with *W. Penns* Notion of Christ, that he is Meekness, Justice, &c. which

are. but Inherent Qualities in Men. and neither are God nor Man.

Pag. 197. Repeating his words in Opposition to *R. G.*'s saying, that *Christ existeth outwardly bodily at Gods right hand*, he saith these Questions are no Conclusions, or positive determinations. *Ans.* I say, they imply Conclusions, and Positive Determinations, else why did he oppose *R. G.* and call for Scripture Proof about them ; It is easie to know when a Query is equivalent to a Conclusion and when not, this is one of his miserable shifts.

Pag. 200. He blames me for injuriously leaving out blood and bones in a Quotation. *Ans.* This was no Material Omission, nor any ways designed. *G. Whitehead* did argue against Christs bodily Existence without us, and against the coming again of that body visibly to be seen, doth he now own Christs body to be flesh, without blood and bones that he makes so great a complaint against me.

Pag. 203. His Quotation out of my Book neither helps him any thing, nor hurts me ; for even there I affirmed, Christs body in Heaven, is the same for substance, which was on Earth, which cleareth me to have been found all along in that great Article of Faith. By Flesh, Blood and Bones I meant, that Christs body now in Heaven, had not such Qualities and Properties of an Animal Fleehly Body, as it had on Earth, as of Hunger, Thirst, Weariness, &c. As where it is said, in the days of his Flesh, and he was Crucified through Weakness.

Pag. 205. He perverts the State of the Question, about the sameness of the Resurrection Bodies of the Saints, he confesseth, that he and his Brethren have objected against the same substance ; which he now would turn, as only Objecting against the same gross substance : grossness and Spirituality of Bodies, make not Bodies differ in substance, False Notions of Philosophy as I have oft said, destroy his and their Faith, but they deny any part of the substance of the Body that dyeth (how much so ever refined) to Rise ; Arguing against it from the *Man-eaters*, see *Caleb Puse* his *Mod. Account*, and *John Pennington*, his *Keith* against *K.*

Pag. 219. His Defence in Answer to *John Horne*, blaming him for saying Christ hath our Nature in Heaven, which *John Horne* cleared that our Nature as it was in Christ was not sinful, this he would deceitfully excuse, as if he did only refute some unsound Antinomian Notions of *John Horne*. But it is no Antinomian Notion, to say, Christ hath our Nature in Heaven, without all sin, for sin is no part of Mans Nature. If *John Horne* did assert any unsound Notion in other things, *G. W.* ought not to oppose him, in that which was sound. [But such a Spirit of Contradiction did so possess him, and them, that Contradict it they would, right or wrong.]

Pag. 218. He is most Sophistical and evasive, about the blood of Christ shed as not in being, as if it had been *W. Burnets* position, whereas let any but Read *W. Burnets* Capital Principles. p. 40. and they will find that it was the Objection of some Quakers Originally, which *W. B.* Did undertake to Answer. And suppose the Assertion had been *W. B.*'s. that, that blood was not in being, yet the conclusion was altogether *G. Whiteheads*, for *W. Burnet* did not so Argue, that blood is not in being, therefore we cannot be justified by it, for that is the thing that *W. B.* presseth, viz. that we are justified by that outward blood, but *G. W.* did oppose it, by Arguing, that blood was not in being, therefore we are not justified by it. Yea when one of the Baptists did affirm, (as *G. W.* Confesseth) that Christ might have taken it up again, *G. W.* opposed it, and called for Scripture to prove it. *Light and Life*, pag. 65. And to this day *G. W.* hath not told us whether that outward blood is in being, therefore let this question be put to him once more, whether it is in being yea or nay.

Pag. 220. Though he seek to cover himself, putting the word for in place of to which as I formerly Noticed mends not the matter, the Quakers see no need to direct either for Jesus Christ, or his blood, as it was shed at Jerusalem, this is still scandalous. Yet he hath quite passed by, and so hath *T. Elwood* his Advocate, that other scandalous place, in the words following, and where do the Scriptures say, the blood, was there shed for justification,

fication, and that men must be directed to Jerusalem to it. (Note to it.) See *Light and Life*. Pag. 38. Th is plainly sheweth G. W's. opposition, to justification by the blood of Christs body that was outwardly shed at Jerusalem, and that he then had no other Notion of justification, but by Blood within, i. e. the *Light within*. And for his Proof, that Men are not justified by the Blood that was there shed, he perverts the Scripture words putting but for and, he dyed for our offences but Rose again for our justification which Resurrection (he saith) surely was after the shedding the Blood outwardly. And from this, he would infer that Christs blood outwardly shed, had no share or part in our justification. See *Rom.* 4. 25; there is not but, but and. And though sometimes but is equivalent to and, yet it cannot be so here in G. Whiteheads sense, who makes his but exclusive, and whereas he still saith such direction is contrary to *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. as also that any should be directed to Christ above the Clouds, see his pag. 8. and 61. He continues to show his unbelief, and Antichristian Doctrine, as if to direct to Christ without, as he suffered Death at Jerusalem for our sins, and is now in Heaven without us, were either contrary to *Rom.* 10. or inconsistent, with directing to his inward appearance in Mens hearts. His Sophistry is dull, to insinuate it was a direction, to go to Jerusalem by Local Motion: But neither W. B. nor any Protestant ever thought so, nor do any Papists make it necessary to Salvation to go to Jerusalem, by Local Motion of the Body, the direction is to the Faith, and Consideration of the Mind, but not to the body by Local Motion.

Pag. 224. He now owns *Sol. Eccles* words, (that the blood outwardly shed by the spear, was no more than the blood of another Sainr) were not in the wisdom and Counsel of God. *Ans.* Was then G. W's. words in the Wisdom and Counsel of God, when he Defended them, by his silly Sophistry, and that to so high a degree, that he saith pag. 58. *Light and Life*, S. E. did highly speak in esteem of the blood of Christ and new Covenant, as more excellent and Loving, and Holy, and Precious than is able to be uttered. which might have satisfied any Spiritual or unbiassed Mind, and yet now, it seems they satisfy not G. W's. mind, who has judged them, not to be in the Wisdom and Counsel of God, and therefore by his own Censure, he is not a Man of a Spiritual and unbiassed Mind.

Pag. 233, 234. Whereas formerly, as I did show in my *Narrative*, G. W. did argue against that blood mentioned, *Acts* 20. Which is called Gods blood, that it could not be Material blood, because God is a Spirit, yet now in Contradiction, he owns that by blood is meant in that place, both Material and Mystical, Gods own blood he saith, was no less than his own dear Son, Christ himself it was a manner of speaking, the blood put for the whole Offering, the whole ransom and price of mans Redemption, both outwardly and inwardly, outwardly by the ransom given by Christs Sufferings and Sacrifice, and inwardly by the operation of his Life, power and Spirit, which Mystically is that precious blood, that is opposed to all corruptible things. Now let us consider the force of G. W's. Argument seeing then that Gods blood is both Material and Mystical, i. e. Spiritual, therefore God is not simply a Spirit. (Oh gross!) but a Material or Corporal being, i. e. a body as well as a Spirit. But he hath not yet proved that the Spirit or Light within Men is that blood which is any part of the Offering or Ransom. And that he saith, the Mystical blood is that precious blood that is opposed to all corruptible things, by this it seems he doth not yet own, that Christs outward blood was that precious blood that is incorruptible.

Pag. 244. Denial of these Four great Essentials (so called,) unjustly charged. *Ans.* These four Essentials, to wit the four mentioned in both my Advertisements, he saith of them in *Parenthesis*, so called wherein he still hides himself, if they be Essentials in his esteem, how then is the Light within sufficient to Salvation without any thing else, according to his Doctrine, if they be not Essentials of the Christian Faith, then they are nothing necessary to be Preached or believed, we even here in Christendom can be Saved without them, for one of them is that Faith in Christ, as he outwardly Suffered, is necessary to our Salvation.

Pag. 254. That the Sufferings of the Quakers in this Age are greater or more unjust than

in the days of Christ, or his Apostles, this being Quoted by the Author of the *Snake* out of *E. Burroughs*, he will not allow nor own it was so first verbally Stated, unless he see his Original Copy. *Ans.* This is a quick dispatch, whatever Quotations hereafter or before are brought that *G. W.* thinks he cannot well Answer, whether his own or others, unless we can produce the Original Copy (in Manuscript) he will not stand to it, Printed Quotations out of their Books will not bind him or them. Whatever is amiss must be thrown on the Printer or Publishers, but not on the Authors. Is not this a miserable shift, and the last Refuge of a desperate Cause. Many other things grossly Sophistical in *G. W.'s. Antidote*, I pass over at present Referring to some other occasion, that may offer, wherein he may be further detected; but why do they let such things remain in their Books without Correction?

I Come in the next place to show you some of the many gross, and palpably Sophistical Antwers and Defences of *T. Elwood*, to some of my Books, and *Narrative*, take a part for the whole, being all of a Sort, until a further occasion of a further Detection: I had cited a true Rule in Logick in one of my Former Books, *ex veris nil nisi verum*, from true Premisses, nothing but a true conclusion can follow, whereupon *T. Elwood* Coins another Axiom of his own, as universal as the other which he falsely applyeth to me, *ex falsis nil nisi falsum*, i. e. from false Premisses nothing but a false Conclusion can follow. See *T. Elwood* his *Further Discovery*, pag. 89. This gives you a taste what Logician he is, if his Axiom, and Logick be true, it will prove him neither an honest Man, nor a Man. First, by his Logick one may so Argue Syllogistically, every *Indian* is an honest Man, *T. Elwood* is an *Indian*, therefore *T. Elwood* is an honest Man, and seeing both Premisses are False, by his Axiom the Conclusion is False, viz. that *T. Elwood* is an honest man, and if that be false, judge ye what sort of a man he is by his own Rule. Again, Secondly, One may so Argue, every Stone is a Man, *T. Elwood* is a Stone, therefore *T. Elwood* is a man, now because the Premisses here are False by *T. Elwood's* Logick, the Conclusion is False, viz. that he is a man, and if he be not a man, by his Logick, judge ye what sort of Creature he is. But take yet another taste of his Logick, I had said in my *Narrative*, that the vertuous Heathens, had the *Genus* of Christianity, but not the *differentia*, so were not Christians, who had not the Faith of Christ as he outwardly dyed, &c. Now hear *Th. Elwood's* Logick, Answer to my *Nar.* pag. 74. I pray, which is of most Moment in his Case, the *Genus*, or the *differentia*,—this *differentia* he calls only some outward Character to distinguish a Christian from a Child of God; as namely an Historical Faith of Christs outward appearance. If they have they *Genus*, though they have not the *differentia*, that's enough to prove them to be Christians: By this Argument of *T. Elwood* a Horse is as much a man, as *T. Elwood*, as thus, he that hath the *Genus* of a Man is a Man, but a Horse hath the *Genus* of a Man, therefore a Horse is a Man, &c. Ye see these ignorant Men, will be meddling with things they know not, and in so doing fall into the greatest absurdities, and yet Father all upon the Dictates of the Spirit.

Pag. 12. Take yet another taste of his Logick, *Further Discovery*, p. 12. suppose (said he) it were true in fact, that untruth, or falsehood, had been discovered in his Books. (viz. in my Books Printed in *Pensilvania*) this hath nothing of Note in it, viz. to excuse me from being blamed, or condemned. But shall men be blamed for things, which are not Discovered, to be? Suppose on a diligent Search in all *T. Elwood's* Books nothing is found blame worthy, either in Doctrine or in Fact, hath this nothing of Note, to excuse him; or again, suppose all is true that is said against *T. Elwood*, and his Brethren, hath this nothing of Note in it to blame him, and them.

Truth desen. p. 99. He denyeth that the blood that came out of Christs side (he being then dead) was to compleat the Offering. *Ans.* A most vile and erroneous assertion, and Contradictory to *G. W.* who now saith the blood outwardly shed, was a part of the Offering, what did the blood of the Beasts after they were slain and dead, that was Sprinkled on the People, signifie? Was not the blood a part of the Typical Offering?

ing? And did it not signifie that the blood of Christ, even all that was shed, as well after his death as before, was a part of the Offering.

Nar. p. 134. He saith, *the blood (by which the Saints are cleansed) is not of another kind from the Spirit.* *Ans.* This is False. Body such as Material blood is and Spirit differ in kind, how much more body and God, Creature and Creator.

Pag. 143. His impertinent Defence of the words of *G. W.* and *W. Penn* about the *Souls of the Deceased Saints being in a state of Purgatory or Widowhead, if they look for the Resurrection of their bodies*, his excuse of Terrestrial and Elementary will not serve, it is the same body for substance, the change being in Qualities from Terrestrial to Celestial, not in Substance and Essence. But if they look for having other bodies not yet attained, this would as much or rather more by their way of Arguing prove them, in a State of Purgatory or Widowhead, as supposing them in any State of incomplete happiness, which both *G. W.* and *W. Penn* supposed very absurd, to think the Deceased Saints, not to be compleatly happy, without all addition, *are they in Heaven by halves* said *W. Penn*? Now if they wait to have a body given them, which yet they want whether it be the Former, or any other, they are not compleatly happy, without any addition, to be given.

Pag. 145. His gross ignorance, in making Flesh, to be *Carnity*, whereas Flesh is a Substance, *Carnity* is but a Mode or Quality of it, which can be changed, and the Substance remain, as when Grass and Earth is changed to Flesh, and Flesh again after Death to Earth and Dust, the *Carnity* or Fleishly quality is changed, but the substance of the body remaineth; he may as well say, Whiteless is White, the Abstract is the Concrete, and *T. Elwood* his ignorance is *T. Elwood* himself.

Pag. 148. *That I hold that the body that is now a gross body, shall be the same gross body at the Resurrection.* *Ans.* This is False, it is the same body in Substance, but it has not the grossness it formerly had, nor many other qualities, yet by an ordinary Figure, if one should say so, its tolerable rightly understood, like that of the Poet, *Qui color albus erat nunc est contrarius albo*, i. e. what was once white is afterwards black. It may be said, the Crucified Jesus is now alive, but not Crucified and alive both at once, so the gross body riseth, or the dead body riseth, i. e. that which was formerly gross, and dead, is Raised alive, but puts off the Qualities of grossness and heaviness, &c. But their ignorant and Nonsensical Quibbles are endless, that bespeak them as void of Common Honesty, as of Common Learning, in any thing that may be truly so called.

Pag. 161. His Sophistical Evasion about *the Thousand years Reign of Christ on Earth*, as if *G. W.* had only opposed Christs Personal coming in that respect, whereas there is nothing to be found in any of his *Opponents* making that the State of the Controversie betwixt him, and them, in the places Cited: and to show that it was Christs coming in Person, without us simply, at the day of Judgment, the professed Faith of all Christendom, that *G. W.* opposed, the proper Places of Scripture, which were brought to prove it by *J. N.* and *W. B. G. W.* perverts them to Christs inward coming, to oppose the Faith of his outward coming, as *Mat. 16. 27. 1 Thess. 4. 15, 17. and ver. 1. 7.*

Pag. 163. He accuseth me of a horrid Slander, that *G. W.* doth Allegorize away Christs Birth, Death, Resurrection. *Ans.* I say, it is no Slander but a just Accusation, in his turning these places of Scripture to Christs Birth, and Resurrection within, which can only be duly understood of Christs Birth and Resurrection without, thus Robbing us of those great Arguments we have to prove Christs Birth and Resurrection without us against the *Jews*, by his strained and Nonsensical Allegories, without any ground from Scripture, so far as the Scripture useth an Allegory, we may, but not otherwise.

Pag. 179. He telleth of the *absurd Allegories of the Fathers*, but nameth none of those absurd Allegories, let him produce if he can, any such absurd Allegorie in the *Fathers*, as that I have above Quoted at large out of *Rich. Hub.*

Pag. 203. To my Quoting *G. VV.* denying that *Christ was bodily seen of Paul*, he saith in that *Book* and *pag.* there is nothing of the matter. *Ans.* Yes, it is in that *Book* though there is a mistake in the *pag.* see *pag. 33.* where at the end of the *pag. G. VV.* makes it an Error in his *Opponent* to say, that *Adam should not have dyed the bodily death, had he not sinned* (Note this vile Error in *G. VV.*) and that when *Paul* saith, *Christ was seen of him last.* 1 Cor. 15. 8. He must needs mean it of his body seen, and seen by bodily sight, which (he saith) is contrary to *Gal. 1. 16.* But whereas *T. Elwood* saith, in *pag. 203.* If *G. VV.* had denied that *Christ was bodily seen of Paul* that had not Allegorized away *Christs Resurrection.* *Ans.* I appeal to all judicious Persons in *Christendom.* if it had not, for seeing *Paul* was as credible a Witness of *Christs Resurrection*, as any of the Apostles and Disciples, to call in Question *Pauls Authority*, is to call in question the Authority of all the Apostles, and the whole New Testament. But rather than *G. VV.*s Authority, and infallibility fail or be called in question, *Pauls Authority* must not only be questioned here by *T. Elwood*, but elsewhere, as in *pag. 162.* to save *G. W.*s credit of infallibility, in Expounding *Pauls Words* 1 Thess. 4. *we that remain.* &c. He saith, why might not the Apostles speak in the first Person [we] as supposing that great and extraordinary appearance and coming of *Christ* (the certain time of which no Man knew, *Mat. 24. 36.*) was so near at hand, that it might probably fall out in his Life time. *Ans.* This is to suppose that *Paul* spoke or Writ by meer Conjecture, and a Divination of his own Brain. whereas *Paul* called expressly what he delivered in that Case the word of the Lord, 1 Thess. 4. 15. Had it not been more Christian, and Reverend for *T. Elwood* to have supposed *G. W.* to have been mistaken, than to put the mistake upon Worthy *Paul*, and so far, as to call his mistake the word of the Lord.

Pag. 210. His excusing *W. Pens* saying, the denying the Locality of *Heaven*, not very offensive. *Ans.* It is not only very offensive, but so highly offensive that to deny a Local Heaven, is to deny that *Christ* is Locally or in body ascended, and that overturns all the Essentials of Christianity.

Pag. 223. He chargeth me with Confusion, and Folly, for saying *Christs body is the same in Substance it was on Earth*, and yet is now a pure *Ætherial* or Heavenly body, also he makes me by *Ætherial* to signify an *Airy body*, whereas by *Ætherial* I meant not *Air*, but *Heavenly*. The word *Ætherial* signifies not only *Air*, but *Heavenly*, as I had so expressed it. But let *T. Elwood* Answer, is not *Christs body* now in Heaven, a pure Heavenly body, and was it not on Earth a body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, and if it be the same in Substance still, then he gives away the Cause that a body can be changed from Earthly and Fleshly to Heavenly and Spiritual, and yet remain the same in substance, or will he say that *Christs body* is Fleshly in the same manner, that it was on Earth, hath it the same Density, Gravity, Passibility it had on Earth, all which are Fleshly Qualities; and whereas in some of my former Books I argued that as the change of the Soul by Conversion, which is a very great change, is not a change in Substance, but in Quality, so the change of the body by the Resurrection is not a change of the Substance, but in Quality, one of my Opponents in *Pennsylvania*, (*a Justice of Peace*) Answered me his Soul was changed in Substance, after he became a Quaker; to this I replied, then if he Owed a Man a Hundred Pounds before, and had not Paid him, he might say he did not Owe him that Hundred Pound. And here let me entertain you with another Diversion, *John Pennington*

in one of his late Books blames me for saying the Bodies of the Saints at the Resurrection, shall have no Heaviness nor Weight to incline them to the Globe of the Earth, as *Christs Body* now in Heaven hath none, &c. [This Notion (he saith) he would do well to evince by plain evidence of Holy Scriptures] from whence

I inferred the great agility and swiftness of Motion, that the Bodies of the Saints at the Resurrection shall be endowed with. Again, in *pag. 51.* He blames me for saying, the Raised Saints shall neither need Candle, nor Light of the Sun even to their

their bodily Eyes, as *Adam* before his Fall, needed no Light of the Candle, or of the Sun, &c. This he saith is *gratis dictum*. That the raised Saints, as to their bodily eyes, shall need it, is *eiusdem farinae*, for as is the Sight so is the Object. For shame let these men cease to cry out against other Professions for holding Carnal Notions of the bodies of the Saints at the Resurrection, while they hold more Carnal Notions of them than any I ever heard or read of. I appeal to this Auditory from whom did they ever Learn, the like *Carnality*, that the bodies of the Saints after the Resurrection, shall have Heaviness and Weight to incline them to the Globe of the Earth, and shall need the Light of a Candle, or Sun to enlighten them, and the manner of his Arguing shows, that at the Resurrection the bodies of the Saints must be Natural Bodies, and not Spiritual, for so he Argues, as is the Sight so the Object, but the Object is natural, the Light of a Candle, and Sun, therefore so is the sight, *viz.* Natural and therefore say I by this Argument so must the Subject of it be also, to wit the Eye, and Body. [Like to this is that in *Pag. 93.* He (to agree with his Brethren, *G. W. and W. S.*) will needs have it, that the trees of the Garden, e. g. the tree of the forbidden fruit, was invisible, and yet the Garden it self a visible place on this Earth. But did ye ever hear such Dotage, he may as well say, visible Men, and Women, bring forth invisible Children, and not visible, as to say, the Trees of the Garden, where *Adam* was placed, were invisible, and the Garden visible.

Like to this is his extream ignorance in blaming me, for saying the Food which our Saviour received, that was of Vegetables and Animals, as Flesh, and Fish, &c. became part of his body, and was turned or changed into incorruptible, *this (he saith) would fetch in the very Beasts of the Field, Fowls of the Air, and Fish of the Sea to become part of Christs body and Flesh in Heaven, he does not understand how the Substance of the Food remaining the same, it is changed from brutish Properties and Qualities, when it becomes a part of Mans body.* Judge Reader if this Man be fit to Print Books, who knows not to distinguish, betwixt the Flesh of a Beast, and the Flesh of a Man, nor how the Beasts Feed him, except they retain their brutish Properties in him, that is because he Eats Hogs Flesh, therefore he hath Hogs in him.

POSTSCRIPT.

NOTE, that for want of time, I could not bring forth, the Twentieth part of what I had to show, of the fallacious, and Sophistical Answers, Defences and abuses of *G. W. T. Elwood* and *John Pennington*, in their Books against me. But what is here brought forth, may serve as a test or Touchstone, whereby to give a large discovery of these Mens gross ignorance, vile errors, and palpable Sophistry, so that rather then they will own any thing to be amiss in any of their Books, they will assert the greatest absurdities, fallshood and Contradictions: What is here said to discover the Sophistry of *G. W. and T. Elwood*, is equally sufficient against what *John Pennington* hath Printed against me, on the same Heads, and to begin a New Refutation of what is in his Books were but to do what is already sufficiently done, in refuting them. And whereas the said *John Pennington* hath Printed a late Book against me, in Answer to my Book of *Explications and Retractions* of some Passages Contained in my former Books, which he calls the *Fig Leaf Cover* Discovered, that Book of his, is such a plain and evident discovery of his unjust and unfair proceeding against me, his ignorance and perverseness of Spirit, in perverting my words that I see no need to give any other Answer to him, or direct to any other Answer, but his own very Book and Books compared fairly with my Books quoted by him, and particularly that last mentioned of my *Explications*, &c.

Pag. 224. Answer to *Nar.* Whereas I charged *T. Elw.* with perverting the Apostles Creed, he recharges me, and lays the whole Ground of his Charge upon a Quibble, i. e. upon the Partic-

cle of for by Arguing most ignorantly and foolishly after his manner, that the word of in that Clause, Conceived of the Holy Ghost as so worded by me, imports him (viz. the Holy Ghost) to have been the Material Cause, as if the thing Conceived had been taken of the matter, or substance of the Holy Ghost, to avoid which (he said) he followed the express words of that Creed. But to detect his Folly, and gross error, let it be considered that it was no perversion of the Apostles Creed, the words by and of both here and oft elsewhere, having the same importance and signification, as denoting the efficient Cause, and not the Material, as where it is said in Scripture, that all things are of God, this doth not import that God is the Material Cause of all things, but the efficient. And the very same Phrase, used by me, which he calls a perversion of the Apostles Creed, is the express Scripture Language, Mat. 1. 20. For that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost, here of denotes the efficient Cause, and not the Material. But my Charge of his perverting the Apostles Creed, and seeking to destroy the Christian Doctrine and Faith is not grounded on a Quibble of by or of—put one for another, which are oft equivalent Terms, as I have shewed, but on his denying the Man Christ to have been produced by Generation of and from the properties of Man in Mary, wherein he vindicates that most absurd Doctrine of St. Crisp, denying the Man Christ to have been produced by Generation, of and from the Properties of Man in Mary, as also he vindicates St. Crisp, his denying Christ produced by Generation, to be a Creature, or that the blood of God, by which the Faithful are bought, is the blood of Christs Humanity, as he was a Creature, which now G. W. has Confessed though in plain Contradiction both to himself, and to St. Crisp. For the Scripture, and also the Apostles Creed do affirm that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, plainly importing that Christ did really take of the Virgins Fleishly Substance and body, which is the property of Man, and whereas Mary came of Abraham and David, therefore Christ according to the Fleish, did partake of the Nature and Properties of Abraham and David, which Stephen Crisp denying, and also denyeth that Christ as so produced was a Creature or Created, it plainly followeth that the Holy Ghost was the Material Cause of that Production, it not being a Created being, as S. C. affirmed, which I still affirm is Blasphemous, and destructive to the Christian Faith, and it is a Scandal to the Protestant Religion, and Professors thereof, that such vile Antichristian, and Blasphemous Errors, and Heresies, should be let pass without Publick Rebukes, Censurs, and Contradictions to them, which I hope and Pray that God in due time will raise up Many Zealously, and in a Christian Spirit to oppose. And seeing Stephen Crisps Book contains such vile Errors now at last contradicted by G. W. who hath owned that blood, Acts 20. to be at least in part, Material blood of Christs Humanity, and consequently created, unless he will say, an uncreated being, is Material, I appeal to all sincere Christians to whose hands this may come, whether S. Crisp deserveth that high commendation given him by T. Elwood in that called his TRUTH DEFENDED, that Eminent Labourer in the Lords Vineyard, who like the other Stephen of Old was full of Faith and of the Holy Ghost, and who to his Extraordinary endowments of Nature had an extraordinary Addition of Divine Wisdom, and Heavenly experiences in the work and way of the Lord. But did ever a man full of the Holy Ghost vent such vile Antichristian Notions, as he hath done. See the Quotations at large in my Book called a True Copy, pag, 21, 22. out of his works Collected. pag. 194.

Pag. 94. By T. E. his seeking to defend W. Pens argument, about the body (of Christ) strictly considered which I blamed, as vitious, it not being in the Premises, and therefore ought not to be in the conclusion, he Falls into another trespass and error by saying, Material and simply natural, were equivalent Terms with strictly considered, for besides that this is False because Christs body was not simply natural, as T. E. hath Confessed, if they be equivalent Terms, then let us see what sort of Syllogisme W. Pens argument must be resolved into by T. Elwoods Sophistical defence. What is Material, or simply natural (i. e. strictly considered) cannot produce a Spiritual being but the body of Christ is material, or simply natural, therefore the body of Christ, material or simply natural, i. e. strictly considered, cannot produce a Spiritual being. Any School boy that hath learned the rudiments of Logick, knoweth that this Syllogisme is still extremely vitious, for it hath the Medium in the conclusion, viz

strictly

strictly considered which T. Elwood saith is equivalent to material and simply natural, but it is a rule universally agreed on by all Logicians, that the Medium neither in whole, nor in part should come into the Conclusion.

Page. 95. 96. His excusing W. Pens, other way of arguing is as weak and Sophistical as the former. One outward thing cannot be the proper Figure or representation of another, the outward Lamb shews forth the inward Lamb, the Jew outward the Jew inward, T. Elwood alledged this argument doth not exclude Christ without to have been figured by the passover but that it was not Christ without only, but Christ within also. But if so, W. Pens argument would have run thus, one outward thing cannot be the proper Figure or representation of another outward thing only, the outward Lamb shews forth not Christ the outward Lamb only, but the inward Lamb also, the Jew outward not the Jew inward only, but the Jew outward also. But as this was not W. Pens Argument, so if it had been, it would have been false, for how doth the outward Jew under the Law, shew forth the outward Jew by way of Figure or Type under the Gospel, and how doth the outward Lamb that was to be a Male of the Flock, a bone of which was not to be broken, and was to be killed at Even, shew forth by way of Figure or Type, the Lamb within, i. e. the Light within? how is the Light within a Male of the Flock? how killed, at Even, and a bone of it not broken? all this is most wretchedly strained to the Light within, which myst easily is understood of the Man Christ without, who was a Male, i. e. a Man not a woman of the Flock, i. e. from among their Brethren, who should come of Judah, who should be put to death, on the Evening of the sixth day of the week, and a bone of him was not to be broken, as accordingly was fulfilled.

To my Argument, that the change of the Soul by Conversion, is not a change in Substance, but in quality, therefore the change of the body by the Resurrection is not a change in Substance, but in quality, one Caleb Pusey in Pensilvania denyeth the parity, because the change of the Soul by Conversion, (saith he) is rather a Purification, then a Transmutation, when I had rescued him.

Next comes that ignorant Person John Pennington to Answer my Argument, but first he accuseth me of a bold Forgery, than which he saith, he never heard a more bold, and what is this bold Forgery, that when Caleb Pusey said the change of the Soul by Conversion, was rather a Purification, than a Transmutation, I understood rather to signifie positively and not comparatively, as oft it doth in common Speech as when we say, rather suffer than sin, the meaning is, let us not sin at all, but suffer, and as it is in John 3. 19. Men loved darkness rather than light, the Sense is positive, they loved the darkness, but not the light. Eph. 4. 28. Steal no more, but rather let him Labour, the Sense is altogether positive, and no wise comparative, Now that Caleb Pusey used the word rather in the Positive sense, and not in the comparative, is clear from his Example he gives, of a body besmeared with dirt, when it is cleansed, but this cleansing of a Body besmeared with dirt, is no Transmutation at all, only the dirt washed off. For if he had granted, the Souls conversion, and Regeneration to have been not only a Purification, but a Transmutation also, either he must have granted my Argument, or say, that the Soul is changed in Substance, when it is converted. But taking the word rather to signifie comparatively, it is still a false Assertion, to say, the Souls conversion, is rather a Purification, then a Transmutation, for this is to make holiness in the Saints, which is the noblest part of Gods image in them, and all the virtues and fruits of the Spirit to be less than the absence of unholiness or a richly coloured Garment, less than a Garment that is only washed, but hath no rich colour on it at all. Thus John Pen. thinks the Miller Caleb Pusey has ground me as he Phraseth it. But let the Reader judge, whether his Assertion and bold Forgery is not ground to a meer nullity.

Next let us hear how John Pen. Answers to my Argument. Page. 128 he saith the Parallel doth not hold, for the Soul that is imortal, is of nearer affinity to Spirit, than to the mortal, which puts on mortality, and the addition it receives of ~~Sanctity~~ ^{Sanctity} and Glory, do not change its Substance. But what is this to the vile low, or corruptible body, which is as Diametrically opposit to Glorious, and Eternal, and incorruptible as any thing can be? Can that be changed into incorruptible and Spiritual, and yet the substance

substance the same as when corruptible, Fleſhly and mortal. *Ans.* The Soul when defiled with ſin, and when purified and beautified with holineſs, differs as widely in theſe two ſtates, as the vileſt body, from the moſt Glorious, and much more, ſeeing ſin is the greateſt deformity and vileneſs and is the cauſe of all the vileneſs and deformity that happens to Humane Bodies, therefore what he ſaith here of the diſparity is merely ſaid and begged, but not proved. As I have formerly ſaid, False Notions of Philoſophy, and ignorance of true Philoſophy deſtroy his and his Brethrens Faith.

Among other groſs perverſions and Miſrepreſentations of my Words by John Pennington, let that be Noticed, how in his Book, called Keith againſt Keith, pag. 99. He brings it as a Principle of mine, quoting my Book Truth Advanced, pag. 28. the Womans being taken out of the Man was after the Fall, and that their Backs were joyned together which I delievered not, as my own Perſwaſion but ſimply related it Hiſtorically, as the Opinion of ſome Myſtick Writers, as is clear from the expreſs words, pag. 28. But whether this Diſſiſion or Separation, was made before or after the Fall, is queſtioned by many; they who think it was after the Fall, bring this Reaſon for it, &c. And ſo I reſolve their Perſwaſion and Reaſons for it, all along to the break in pag. 29. again, in pag. 28. I ſay— from all which they conlude (I did not ſay I conlude) that the woman being ſeparate from the man, was a conſequent of the fall. Another perverſion of his, that he quotes the words, of man and womans being made back to back before the Fall, which as they are not the words in the Book and Pag. Cited by him, ſo they are not the Senſe, but quite contrary to the Senſe intended by theſe Authors, whoſe Sentence I related Hiſtorically, and which hath an Allegorical Senſe, viz. The diſſonance of the properties of Nature after the Fall.

Note, Reader the Moderate Church Man, as G. W. ſtiles him, in his Printed Half Sheet, called Reflections upon ſome paſſages in G. Keiths Narrative, among other very unjoyned and erroneous Aſſertions, in vindication of theſe erroneous Perſons, hath this groſs Reflection, which, when I Read, it being ſo extremely False, and contrary to the profeſſed Faith of all ſincere Chriſtians, as well as the Church of England, I could not, but admire at the Mans ignorance, and raſhneſs, to put ſuch a ſaying in Print. Having Quoted a paſſage in my Narrative, pag. 38. One appealed to the Monthly Meeting whether they ever heard of ſuch Doctrine Preached in the Quakers Meeting directing them to Faith in Chriſt without us, I answered, the more ſhame, &c. He answers, giving this Reflection, To ſay that Chriſt without us, is the Object of our Faith, is a very ſcandalous Expreſſion. The Author of theſe Reflections hath put his name to it, Edmund Elyes who (as I am informed) is a Miniſter of the Church of England.

Note, Theſe Marks [] in ſeveral places contain Annotations, and Remarks of things, not ſo fully Diſcourſed, and Treated on in the MEETING, and ſome few new Additions.

For a further Refutation of T. Elwoods Sophiſtical Answers to my former Narrative on theſe Four Heads abovementioned, the Reader may Read the Book called Sathan Diſrobed, &c.

ERRATA.

Page 5. l. 13. r. hypocriſie. p. 8. l. 21. r. Man. l. 39. dele and p. 9. l. 25. before ſayes, r. one. p. 12. l. 12. after foundation, r. excluding Chriſt. p. 14. l. 5. for have r. hath. p. 15. l. 43. after ad r. is. In the firſt p. of the 3d. Sheet, for pag. 33. r. 17. that ſheet is wrong Polied, which correct thus, p. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. p. 19. f. ann r. and. p. 17. l. 28. after England add] p. 24. l. 7. f. hat r. that. p. 29. l. f. the r. that. l. 26. f. loving r. living. l. 37. outwardly, r. inwardly.

FINIS.